

The finest tribute ever accorded to sterling merit is contained in THE LANCET, of August 8, 1891, pages 207-8, which embodies the "Report of THE LANCET Special Commission on Natural Mineral Waters," "Johannis"—the subject of the Report—being selected from amongst the Natural Mineral Waters of the world as worthy of this distinction.

PROMOTES APPETITE. ASSISTS DIGESTION. PROLONGS LIFE

"JOHANNIS."

THE KING OF NATURAL TABLE WATERS.

CHARGED ENTIRELY WITH ITS OWN NATURAL GAS.

To be obtained from all Chemists, Wine Merchants, and Stores at the following prices per Dozen delivered:—

	Bottles.	1-Bottles.	1-Bottles.	Bottles.	1-Bottles.	1-Bottles.
London	6/-	4/6	3/6	Country	6/6	5/- 3/9

Springs:

ZOLLHAUS, GERMANY.

London Offices:

25, REGENT STREET, S.W.

MIDLAND RAILWAY HOTELS.

Specialties:
COMFORT.
CUISINE.

VERY MODERATE CHARGES.

LONDON - MIDLAND GRAND HOTEL.
(St. PANCRAZ, N.W.) (This Hotel is within Shilling cab fare of Gray's Inn, Inns of Court, Temple Bar, and Law Courts, &c. Omnibuses to all parts every minute.)

LIVERPOOL - ADELPHI HOTEL.
(The Hotel de Luxe of the North.)
BRADFORD - MIDLAND HOTEL.
(Excellent Restaurant.)
LEEDS - QUEEN'S HOTEL.
DERBY - MIDLAND HOTEL.

W. TOWLE, Manager Midland Railway Hotels.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED OVER HALF A CENTURY.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,
SIMPLE,

THE
PERFECTED
OF
LIFE
ASSURANCE.

AND
SECURE.

TOTAL ASSETS, £2,831,000. INCOME, £318,000.

The Yearly New Business exceeds ONE MILLION.

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. Lord HALSBURY.
The Right Hon. Lord COLERIDGE, The Lord Chief Justice.
The Hon. Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.
The Right Hon. Sir JAMES PARKER DEANE, Q.C., D.C.L.
FREDERICK JOHN BLAKE, Esq.
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS.....	393	NEW ORDERS, &c.....	403
AN ORIGINATING SUMMONS DEFINED ..	396	LEGAL NEWS	406
THE PRACTICAL WORKING OF THE		COURT PAPERS.....	404
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1894	396	WINDING UP NOTICES	404
REVIEWS	396	CREDITORS' NOTICES.....	404
LAW SOCIETIES	402	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.....	405

VOL. XXXVIII., No. 25.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, APRIL 21, 1894.

Cases Reported this Week.

In the Solicitors' Journal.

Cahill, Re. Logan v. Cahill	390
Heath and Others v. Overcross of	
Weaverham	400
Higley v. Reynolds & Phillips	401
Kent v. Ward	401
Lumley, Re.	398
Pinhorn, Re. Moreton v. Hughes	400
Rebeck, Re. Bennett v. Rebeck	399
Reg. v. Mead (Metropolitan Police	
Magistrate)	400
Tomlinson v. Hampson	401
W. Holloway, Re. Ex parte Follister	398
Walker v. The Lambeth Waterworks	
Co.	399

In the Weekly Reporter.

Boxsius v. Goblet Frères and Others ..	392
Hooper v. Hill	394
Ives and Barker v. Willans	396
Jacobs v. Crusha and Others	397
James (Appellant) v. Jones (Re-	
spondent)	400
Palborough School Board Election Peti-	
tion, In re. Bourke and Others,	
Petitioners. Nutt, Respondent	398
Somerset (Appellant) v. Wade (Re-	
spondent)	390
Thorneloe v. Hill	397

CURRENT TOPICS.

WE ARE glad to learn that the indisposition from which Lord Justice KAY has been suffering is not at all of an alarming nature, and is only of a character which can be easily remedied. His lordship is expected to resume his duties in court on Monday next.

IN CONSEQUENCE of the state of the list of non-witness actions before Mr. Justice STIRLING, it was announced on Tuesday last that witness actions would be in the paper on the following day. However, the learned judge found he had enough cases to occupy him this week, and will only begin the hearing of witness actions on Tuesday, the 24th inst., as originally announced.

WE ARE INFORMED that the Lord Chancellor, having consulted the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, has determined to carry out his view with reference to filing of all Chancery orders, and has given instructions for the preparation of rules for carrying out the proposed arrangement, with the intention of laying such rules before the Rule Committee. It is not stated that the judges, and more especially those of the Court of Appeal and of the Chancery Division, have been consulted, nor do we hear that practising barristers and conveyancers have had an opportunity of giving an opinion on the subject, nor that solicitors, except as represented by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, have been consulted. Looking at the new venture in a comprehensive way, we can only reiterate our opinion, previously expressed, that the change is uncalled for, and will create dissatisfaction in several important quarters.

ALTHOUGH it is believed that no appointment to the vacant Lordship of Appeal was made up to Thursday evening, no doubt appears to be entertained that Sir CHARLES RUSSELL has been offered and will accept the post. If he does, we think that few lawyers will be found to say that the appointment is a good one. Sir CHARLES's admirable qualities as an advocate, and the nature of the cases in which he has deservedly gained high renown, do not afford any great guarantee of the possession by him of a profound and accurate knowledge of law or the power of dealing satisfactorily on appeal with the important questions which come before the House of Lords. Who will be ready to affirm that his review of the judgments of learned and experienced judges—some of them among the ablest lawyers who ever sat on the bench—will command general confidence? But, even if we were to admit that, within his range, Sir CHARLES RUSSELL, applying his great ability to his new functions, may make a fairly good appeal judge, what are we to say to the scandal of appointing a common law practitioner to a tribunal which is notoriously weak in equity judges? There probably never was a time when the law lords who sit to hear appeals were so deficient in practical experience of matters coming from the Chancery Division, yet this is the time which is chosen for appointing a new Lord of Appeal without any knowledge of these matters.

REFERRING to the recommendation of the Bar Committee that the daily cause list should be published on Saturdays at one o'clock, and on other days at four o'clock, there are various matters to be considered before it can be adopted. The courts sit until four o'clock on each day except Saturday, when they rise at two o'clock. Seeing that the cause list for the following day cannot well be settled until just before the rising of the court, and that it has to be printed, it is obvious that a strictly accurate list cannot be printed and published before the court rises for the day. In practice, it is common knowledge that the draft of the list for the following day is always brought into court in print, and is finally settled, shortly before the rising of the court, and the number of cases to be left in the list is decided on and any other necessary corrections are made. After the court rises, the time taken in "making up" and "striking off" cannot be very great, and the list is usually published soon after five o'clock, and on Saturdays about three. It might, indeed, be useful to publish an early edition of the following day's paper say at three o'clock, or on Saturdays at one o'clock, but this would be accompanied by disadvantages of an important nature. Of course the early edition would be so labelled as to shew it not to be final, but it would, in many cases, get into the early evening papers and be sent into the country, and so have a tendency to mislead. With this sort of inconvenience to face, perhaps a partial compliance with the recommendation might be effected by posting up in some prominent position a written or partly written draft of the lists, so that it might be consulted by those concerned, and by expediting by a short time the publication of the list as finally settled. As a fact, however, three written drafts of the following day's list are posted up—one at the Carey-street entrance, one at the main entrance of the Royal Courts, and one in the Temple. Any change in the time of publication must be subject to the contingency, not infrequent, of a judge being in the act of delivering judgment at the moment when the court would, under ordinary circumstances, rise for the day; such a contingency may postpone the publication of the list for an hour or more. It must also be remembered that until every item of the list is brought in to the printers the list cannot be sent to press. The printing takes place within the building, and the last proofs are corrected in the press-room.

WE POINTED OUT last week that the Bill to amend the Law of Inheritance, lately brought into the House of Lords by the Lord Chancellor, only renders the land of an intestate divisible, and does not vest it in any person for the general purposes of administration. We cannot help thinking that the Bill, if passed into law in its present shape, will lead to great difficulty. So far as we are aware, it is the universal practice of conveyancers, when they prepare a will having for its object the division of land among beneficiaries, to vest the land in trustees for sale, so as to cause it to be converted into money in equity, and to direct the trustees to divide the money, not the land itself, among the beneficiaries. By the artifice of authorizing the sale to be postponed, and directing that the *interim* rents till sale shall belong to the beneficiaries in the same shares as they would be entitled to the proceeds of sale, the beneficiaries are enabled to retain the land *in specie* as long as they think fit. Some foolish testators insist on the land being divided *in specie*. Where this is the case no trust for sale can be inserted, but in lieu thereof the prudent conveyancer inserts a power of partition. No doubt some cases occur where land is given to tenants in common without any provisions for division; but it will generally be found in such cases that either it is the intention that the beneficiaries should enjoy the land as a whole, as in the case of a limitation to daughters as tenants in common in tail, or the beneficiaries are adults, and therefore require no special provisions to enable them to divide the land. The Bill provides that "on the death of a person intestate as to any real estate that real estate shall be divisible among the same persons as if it were personal estate as to which he had died intestate." The "persons" intended appear to be

(1) If the intestate leaves no husband or wife, his or her statutory next of kin.

(2) If the intestate leaves a widow, his statutory next of kin and the widow.

(3) If the intestate leaves a husband, the husband.

It will be observed that it will generally happen in either of the two first cases that some, at least, of the "persons" will be infants. It appears to follow that, as there is no person who has power to divide the land between them, a partition action will be rendered necessary in most cases.

BUT THERE IS a question of considerable difficulty arising on this provision. Does the word "persons" include the creditors of the deceased? If it does, the effect appears to be to give a statutory right to the creditors to have the realty divided between them without providing any mechanism for its sale. It will be observed that, if this view is correct, it will never be safe to take a conveyance of the realty from the beneficiaries without ascertaining that all the debts have been paid, and that the statement of the personal representatives that this is the case will not be sufficient. On the other hand, if the word "persons" does not include creditors, it may be argued that the persons to whom the real estate is given by the Act are to take it free from the debts of the deceased person. Probably both these views are incorrect. While we speak with some hesitation on a point of considerable difficulty, we think that the true construction of the Bill is to substitute the persons, other than creditors, who on the death of the intestate become entitled beneficially to his personality for his heirs, leaving the creditors, if it becomes necessary to enforce their debts against the land, to the same remedies that they would have had against the heirs if the Bill had not been passed. If this last view is correct, the Bill, if passed into law, will render it necessary to take legal proceedings for the purpose of obtaining payment of debts out of real estate in many cases where it is not necessary at present. In most cases under the present law the heir is one person, not many persons. If that person is an adult, and it becomes necessary to resort to the land to obtain payment of the debts, an action is not necessary, as he can raise the required amount by sale or mortgage, and unless he is very foolish, he will do so sooner than incur the expense of the legal proceedings rendered necessary by his refusal. Under the Bill there will generally be more than one person entitled to the land, often one of them will be an infant, and where this is the case legal proceedings will be necessary whenever it becomes necessary to resort to the land for payment of the debts. While we have pointed out some defects in the Bill, we consider it to be a step in the right direction. We quite feel that, after the reception given by the House of Lords to the Bill brought in by the Lord Chancellor last session (discussed 37 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 340), he may well have hesitated to adopt the wiser course of vesting the real estate in the personal representatives. We feel confident, however, that if the present Bill passes into law the inconveniences we have pointed out will soon be felt, and that the necessity of vesting the real estate in the personal representatives will soon be apparent.

THE DECISION of the House of Lords in *The British and American Trustee and Finance Corporation v. Couper* settles that upon a petition for the reduction of the capital of a company under the Companies Acts, 1867 and 1877, the court may sanction a reduction by the purchase of shares, and also that the purchase may extend to some only of the shares of a particular class. That the purchase of shares involves a reduction of capital, and is therefore not within the ordinary powers of a company, has been clear since *Treco v. Whitworth* (36 W. R. 145, 12 App. Cas. 409); but, under the statutes specially authorizing reduction, there appears to be no reason why it should not take place in this manner. The Act of 1877 expressly extended the Act of 1867 so as to permit of the reduction of paid-up capital, and, as pointed out in the House of Lords on the present occasion, section 4 of the later Act, in providing specially for the case where the reduction of the capital does not involve the payment to any shareholder of any paid-up capital, contemplates that the reduction of capital may be effected by such payment. But while it is clear that under the Acts capital may be returned to

shareholders, whether by way of purchase of shares with subsequent cancellation of them, or otherwise, the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Re Denver Hotel Co.* (41 W. R. 339; 1893, 1 Ch. 495) has been supposed to sanction the doctrine that, if any one shareholder was thus dealt with, the court could not sanction the scheme unless a similar course was taken with regard to all other shareholders of the same class. Referring to the clause in section 3 of the Companies Act, 1877, which declares that the power to reduce capital shall include a power to pay off any capital in excess of the wants of the company, LINDLEY, L.J., said: "These words cannot, in our opinion, be construed so as to enable a company to prefer one shareholder to another of the same class as himself by buying up his shares." The House of Lords, however, have now held that no such restriction is to be read into the Acts. The power to reduce capital is perfectly general, and may be exercised in any manner that commends itself to the court. A minority of the shareholders who object to a scheme which does not deal with all upon the same terms is protected, not by any restriction contained in the provisions of the statutes, but by the fact that such a scheme will be closely scrutinized by the court.

THE CASE of *Pitcher v. Bourn*, which was noticed in these columns a short time ago (*ante*, p. 282), has given rise to considerable discussion on the part of county court registrars and others. The Queen's Bench Divisional Court (MATHEW and COLLINS, JJ.) were reported to have there held, incidentally, that the payment of the costs of an abortive execution cannot be enforced by judgment summons in the county court, though it is expressly provided by ord. 25, r. 12^b, of the County Court Rules, 1889, that costs of warrants, whether executed, unexecuted, or unproductive, shall be allowed against the defendant, unless the judge shall otherwise direct. However, in a case decided last week in the Marylebone County Court, Judge STONOR was able to state that it had been now ascertained that in *Pitcher v. Bourn* the county court rule just mentioned was clearly inapplicable, because there the abortive execution took place in the High Court, and not, as had been supposed, in the county court. Consequently, as Judge STONOR held in the case before him, where the costs of an abortive execution have been incurred in the county court they may still, as heretofore, be added to the original debt and costs and included in the judgment summons.

AN ORIGINATING SUMMONS DEFINED.

THE judgment of the full Court of Appeal of six judges in the case of *Re Holloway* (reported elsewhere) is a little hard on the judges, chief clerks, and registrars of the Chancery Division. If there was one thing which they were supposed to know more about than anything else it was an originating summons. They, or their predecessors in office, may be said to have invented originating summonses, and to have worked their invention themselves, and with such success that from 1883 down to the present time a tendency has manifested itself strongly in rules of court to extend the scope of procedure by originating summonses. And yet, according to the judgment in *Re Holloway*, which must be regarded as finally defining an originating summons, it appears that from 1883 down to the present time the judges and officials of the Chancery Division have never even known what an originating summons was, and in their ignorance they have imposed unnecessary requirements upon countless suitors and exacted from them in fees many thousands of pounds more than they had any right to demand.

Let us now consider the precise point which has been determined in *Re Holloway*. In that case an ordinary summons was issued out of the Queen's Bench Division under 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73 for delivery up of papers by a solicitor. The summons was headed "In the matter of W. HOLLOWAY, one of the solicitors," &c., in the ordinary way, and was in the form calling upon the solicitor to attend within four days before the master in chambers. Without going into the side issues raised, it is sufficient to say that the appellant contested the validity of the summons on the broad ground that it was not in the form prescribed by

rules of court for originating summonses, which, in order to bind the person against whom it was issued, it was bound to be. At the very outset the court raised the question which lay at the root of the whole matter—viz., Was it an originating summons at all? If it was, there could be no doubt that it was wrong, because every originating summons issued out of any division of the court must be in the form prescribed by the Rules of November, 1893, which calls upon the respondent to enter an appearance within eight days. If it was not an originating summons, then it was an ordinary summons, in which case it was in proper form, not being in any way affected by the Rules of November, 1893.

If the judgment delivered in this case had been confined to a determination of this question, it would not have had the far-reaching consequences which it appears likely to have. It would merely have decided what the Master of the Rolls held—viz., that a summons under the Solicitors Act is not an originating summons, because, although it may be originating in form and for its immediate purpose, it is not originating in nature, seeing that it deals with, and arises out of, previous proceedings of some sort. But the other members of the court went on to consider and determine the further question, What is an originating summons? And on this point the court delivered a judgment of the utmost importance, which, as we have said, shews that the definition adopted and acted upon all these years in the Chancery Division has been entirely wrong.

The judgment of the court on this point was graphically summed up by A. L. SMITH, L.J. He said: "Ord. 71, r. 1, defines an originating summons in the following words:—'An originating summons means a summons by which proceedings are commenced without writ.' Now I read that as if it had been as follows:—'An originating summons means a summons by which proceedings are commenced without writ which might otherwise have been commenced by writ,' and that it does not mean a summons commencing proceedings which could not have been commenced by writ." Lord Justice LINDLEY gave a historical sketch of the gradual extension of procedure by originating summons to causes of action which were first exclusively brought to the court by bill and afterwards by writ, and he said that in all cases where this extension was made the intention was to allow that to be done by originating summons which could have been done by bill, or later by writ of summons. Lord Justice KAY said that there were three kinds of summonses—(1) summonses in pending proceedings, which were "ordinary summonses"; (2) summonses originating actions or matters in lieu of a writ, which were "originating summonses"; and (3) summonses initiating a proceeding, but not commencing an action—*e.g.*, under the Solicitors Act—which were not therefore "originating summonses." He did not give these last any name, and we shall not attempt to do so, because it is clear that "statutory summons" does not completely cover class (3), for which, however, some distinguishing title will have to be found by new rules of court, for which *Re Holloway* has created a pressing necessity, as we hope to be able to shew to demonstration before we have done.

Starting with the authoritative definition of originating summons established by this judgment—viz., "A summons commencing proceedings which might otherwise have been commenced by writ"—let us endeavour to apply it to procedure in the Chancery Division. Hitherto every summons which commenced a proceeding in the Chancery Division, whether under the Solicitors Act or any other statute, or under rules of court, has been an originating summons, and has been so charged for and dealt with. Under the statutory jurisdiction of the Chancery Division an immense number of matters are commenced by originating summons which cannot and never could have been commenced by bill or writ. These, therefore, are no longer originating summonses. Let us take, for example, a summons under the Conveyancing Act, 1881, (s. 69 (3)), or the Settled Land Act. How is such a summons to be issued in the Chancery Division in future? Ord. 55, r. 20, which provides that an originating summons in the Chancery Division shall be issued at the Central Office, no longer applies to it. It cannot be issued at the Central Office, not being an originating summons. It must presumably, therefore, be issued as an "ordinary summons"—that is to say, it must issue

from Chancery Chambers. But there is a preliminary difficulty. There being no previous proceeding of which it forms part, how is the judge to be selected? If we turn to ord. 5, r. 9, we find a complete code of specific provisions for assigning "every cause or matter which shall hereafter be commenced in the Chancery Division" by ballot to a judge of that division. That rule provides specifically for the only four methods known before *Re Holloway* of commencing proceedings in the Chancery Division—viz., by writ (sub-section A); by originating summons (sub-section B); by notice of motion (sub-section C); and by petition (sub-section D). The summons which commences proceedings but is not an originating summons is not provided for. The rule will, therefore, have to be extended before effect can be given to the judgment in *Re Holloway*, and until the rule is so extended there will be no authorized means of obtaining an assignment to a judge.

Turning now to ord. 55, r. 2, with its eighteen sub-sections, we find a list of various branches of business which may be disposed of in Chancery Chambers. How is a litigant to know whether he is now to proceed in any, and if any which, of those matters by ordinary summons? It will be necessary for him to find out before he begins, because the costs under an ordinary summons are very different from those under an originating summons. The test will be, Can this proceeding be commenced by a writ as well as by a summons? If it can, then this summons is an originating summons, but not otherwise. This same test will have to be carried further than ord. 55, r. 2. Before a solicitor can decide whether he is to begin by originating summons or common summons in chambers, in matters comprised in the statutory jurisdiction of the Chancery Division, he must apply the above test. There are summonses for example, under the Burial Acts (for appropriation of charity lands), the Charitable Trusts Acts, the Charitable Uses Acts, the Consolidated Fund Act, the Copyhold Acts (for investment of money in court), the Conveyancing Act, 1881, the Drainage and Improvement of Land Acts; the Lands Clauses Consolidation Acts; the Legacy Duty Act, the Mortgage Debenture Acts, the Parliamentary Deposits Act, The Pauper Lunatics Acts, the Railway Companies Act, 1867, the Settled Land Acts, the Trustee Relief Act, the Vendor and Purchaser Act. How many of these come under the ruling in *Re Holloway*? And who is to decide before the summons is issued? It will be very hard on practitioners if they are to be left to their own devices to decide, in the light of *Re Holloway*, which of these matters are proper cases for the issue of an originating summons as now defined, and which for the issue of an ordinary summons.

This brings us to a most singular circumstance in connection with the judgment in *Re Holloway*. In discussing the definition of an originating summons given in the rules, LINDLEY, KAY, and A. L. SMITH, L.J., all regarded an originating summons as an alternative process to a bill or writ, and the definition finally arrived at was based entirely on the assumption that it had come into existence as a substitute in certain cases for a bill or writ. The case was, unfortunately, argued from the Queen's Bench side, and there was no one, therefore, to bring to the notice of the judges the most important fact that they were altogether overlooking procedure by original petition in Chancery. Looking back over the statutes we have named, applications under many of them were by petition, and at the present time applications under them are by petition or summons. According to the definition laid down so clearly in *Re Holloway*, these summonses are not originating summonses because proceedings for the same purposes could not have been commenced by bill or writ. Originating summons as an alternative to the commencement of proceedings by petition was not thought of, apparently. In some of the later Acts, moreover, such as the Conveyancing Act, 1881, the Settled Land Act, and others, the application is specifically restricted by the Act or rules to a summons. What sort of summons was intended? On this point we are not entirely without information embodied in rules of court. The Rules of November, 1893, prescribe a form of originating summons not *inter partes* (ord. 54, r. 4b, Appendix K., No. 1b), and the Rule Committee inserted in that form, by way of illustration of the form of heading, the words "And in the Matter of the Trustee Act, 1893." Applications under this Act are to be made by petition (ord. 54b, r. 2), or for certain

purposes by summons (ord. 55, r. 13A). Here, then, is an actual case in point where the alternative methods of commencing proceedings are by petition or summons. If that summons is not an originating summons, why did the Rule Committee give, as an illustration of the way to fill in the heading of one of their own originating summonses, "In the Matter of the Trustee Act, 1893"? It appears to us, in the light of *Re Holloway*, that a rule has become urgently necessary giving a catalogue of summonses commencing proceedings which are originating summonses and of those which are not.

In considering this judgment in its practical bearing upon procedure on the Chancery side it is necessary to refer to the question of records. Every action or matter commenced by writ or originating summons is a matter of record—that is to say, a reference number is given to it on issue of the writ or originating summons, and the proceedings are entered, as provided by rules and practice, in the general cause books. This practice does not, of course, apply to any summonses which are not originating summonses. Considering the immense importance of the record in the case of summonses under the Settled Land Act, for example, and the Vendor and Purchaser Act, where the record is a necessary part of the title established, it could never surely have been intended that proceedings such as these should be commenced and terminated without a record being kept which could be open to search and inspection by persons interested. This also will have to be provided for by rule.

Again, on the question of court fees, is it conceivable that the loss of some £1,500 a year, which will be involved in charging only three shillings for the issue of these summonses commencing proceedings which are not originating summonses, will be agreeable to the Treasury, when they initiate proceedings in the court of far greater importance than half the actions commenced by writ?

One word, before we conclude, as to solicitors' costs. A solicitor is allowed on taxation for an originating summons, for instructions, preparing, and issuing, a maximum fee of £2 15s. 4d., and a defendant or respondent is allowed 6s. 8d. for perusing, and (if an agent) 4d. per folio for a close copy. For an ordinary summons, no instructions are allowed, the total fee being 13s. 4d., while the other side is not allowed any fee for perusing. Which of these two allowances is to prevail in the case of summonses which commence proceedings, but are not originating summonses? A summons under the Settled Land Act, for example, is no longer an originating summons. Is a solicitor's remuneration for preparing and issuing such a summons to be 13s. 4d. in future? Take a summons under section 10 for authority to make building or mining leases on terms specified. As we understand *Re Holloway*, that is now an ordinary three-shilling summons. In view of the great importance of such cases as this, it will surely be necessary to alter Appendix N. of the R. S. C., 1883, or to make a rule permitting the costs for originating summons to be allowed in the case of a summons which commences proceedings but is not an originating summons. We commend this point to the attention of the profession.

We have said enough to shew that, while the decision in *Re Holloway* has supported existing procedure by summons commencing proceedings on the Queen's Bench side, it has dealt a staggering blow to existing procedure by originating summons on the Chancery side; and that, while it has settled one controversy, it has, if we mistake not, by the carefully formulated definition imported into it, created another controversy far greater, both in extent and importance.

THE PRACTICAL WORKING OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1894.

I.

ABOUT six weeks have elapsed since the Local Government Act, 1894, took its place upon the Statute Book. It was brought very prominently before the public during its troublous passage through Parliament, and its provisions have been frequently adverted to in these columns. But when once a Bill has become

law the question of importance is no longer—Ought not such and such a provision to be substituted for the provision in the text? Cannot the measure be amended in this or that direction? It has become law, and the important point to consider is—Is the machine well adapted to produce the result which is intended—be that result good or bad? Is the Act clear, effective, consistent with itself and with other Acts? or, Is it faulty in construction, of doubtful import, are its provisions difficult to reconcile? Upon the answers to these questions will depend the capabilities of any measure for working smoothly and producing good results.

We propose to consider the prospects of this measure from a practical point of view, and for that purpose its provisions may be conveniently reviewed under the heads of the different local authorities who will be mainly responsible for carrying its provisions into effect. These are—I. County Councils. II. District Councils and Boards of Guardians. III. Parish Councils.

I. COUNTY COUNCILS.—The county councils are the first bodies to be affected by the Act. The first elections of district and parish councillors will not take place before the 8th of November in the present year; but there is a vast amount of work which ought to be done long before that date in order to carry out the provisions of the Act; and the bulk of this work falls upon the county councils.

Their duties under the Act may perhaps be divided, roughly, into three heads:—1. Altering areas and boundaries so as to facilitate the working of the Act. 2. Bringing parish councils into existence. 3. Controlling the exercise of the powers of parish councils.

1. It is as to areas and boundaries that the duties of county councils under the Act arise soonest and are the most difficult of execution. They are to consider the cases which appear to call for interference "forthwith"; they are to act "as soon as practicable"; they are to complete their work in two years, except in any case where the Local Government Board grants further time, and, if they fail to meet this requirement, their powers are to be transferred to that Board. It appears, therefore, that there is no uncertainty as to the necessity for rapid action under this head. The county councils are to do something at once: but what? and how? These are questions of very great difficulty, arising partly from the subject-matter involved, partly from the obscurity of certain provisions of the Act. It would be quite impossible in the compass of an article to enumerate the powers of a county council under this Act and the kindred provisions of the Act of 1888 as to the alteration of areas and boundaries. It must suffice to point out in general terms the object which is aimed at and some of the difficulties which lie in the way of carrying it out.

The object which it is sought to effect, and chiefly through the medium of orders of county councils, is the creation of a uniform system of local government areas in every administrative county in the kingdom. The parish is the unit: except where a county council for special reasons otherwise order, each parish is to be wholly included in a sanitary district ("county district," as it is now to be called), and each county district is to be wholly included in the same county. There is a symmetry and a simplicity about this arrangement of areas which at once commend it as desirable. Of the difficulty of carrying it out no one who is unacquainted with the details of local government can have any conception. Throughout the country cases are commonly to be found where parts of the same parish lie in several different county districts and in two or more counties; and it is no less common to find county districts lying partly in one county, and partly in another. Now the boundaries of a county (or of a borough) cannot be altered by a county council. The object of bringing each subordinate area wholly within the limits of the area next above it can only be effected by a county council by dividing parishes and county districts, and where necessary adding the new areas so formed to other similar areas within the same superior area. It will often be impossible to effect the desired object by making each division of an area which lies in a separate superior area into a separate area for the same purposes as the area of which it originally formed part; for in that way areas would be formed which would be far too small for the purposes for which they were intended. Again,

there will often be serious practical obstacles in the way of uniting one area with an adjoining area in the same superior area. It is true that where the object in view in altering areas and boundaries can be best effected by means of an alteration in the boundary of a county or borough, that may be effected by an order of the Local Government Board made upon the application of a county council; but county councils will no doubt prefer to act, and it is evidently intended that they should act, as far as possible, without having recourse to the superior authority. Any order made by a county council for the alteration of areas or boundaries will, of course, involve provision being made for the adjustment of the property and liabilities and rights of the areas and persons affected; this of itself is no light matter.

Altogether county councils have serious difficulties to overcome in the performance of the duties as to alteration of areas and boundaries which are cast upon them by the Act. So difficult is the task which lies before them that it certainly seems unnecessary to increase their perplexity by inviting them, under the head of "areas and boundaries," to consider other matters as to which they have no power of action whatsoever; yet this seems to be done by section 36. The county council is to consider various matters, as to some of which they are to act, while as to others no action is necessary or possible, or any change which is desirable is sufficiently effected by the Act itself, without the assistance of the county council.

2. The duty of county councils as to creating parish councils may not prove very onerous. They consist chiefly in making orders for the establishing of councils in the small parishes whose population is under the limit which entitles a parish to have a council by virtue of the Act itself and for the grouping of several parishes under a common parish council. As to these duties the Act lacks clearness in prescribing whether such orders can be made upon the initiative of the county council or only upon the application of a parish; it is certain that neither an order establishing a council nor a grouping order can be made without the consent of any parish concerned; but what parishes can apply for a council is left in considerable doubt.

County councils have further duties to perform within the next few months as to starting parish and district councils on their way. They must fix (within certain limits) the number of parish councillors for each parish, and they may fix the number of guardians and district councillors; and the numbers so fixed may be revised from time to time. They have powers (couched in unfortunately vague language: see section 80) to remove difficulties as to the first elections and first meetings of parish and district councils, and for this purpose they may even "modify the provisions of this Act."

3. Once the parish councils have been brought into existence we are on firmer ground, and the powers of the county council are more definite. They are the authorities to decide in the first instance as to the desirability of putting compulsory powers into force as to the acquisition of land by a parish council for the purposes of its powers and duties, including the much-discussed hiring of land for allotments; every loan by a parish council will require the sanction of the county council; they will exercise a control over the manner in which the public documents of a parish are being preserved; they may remove difficulties arising out of a failure to elect a sufficient number of councillors in a parish, and may assist and control parish councils in the exercise of their powers and duties in other ways which do not call for special mention. The matters in which a county council may control the subordinate authorities are for the most part clearly defined by the Act, and this may be said to form one of its most satisfactory features.

The Act would be a better measure if the definiteness which characterizes the provisions relating to this controlling jurisdiction had extended to the other no less important duties of county councils which have been referred to. And, to speak generally of the Act, it would have been infinitely easier to construe had not the modern system of legislation by reference to other legislation been followed to an extent rarely, if ever, paralleled even in recent years. Section after section, Act after Act, is incorporated; the incorporated enactments themselves incorporate other enactments until the clearest brain becomes

bewildered in the attempt to construe what seems a simple sub-section until it is read in the light—or the obscurity—thrown upon it by the mass of provisions which are to be “deemed” to be a part of it. Parliamentary exigencies are mainly responsible for this system, and no doubt they have to be considered, but in an Act which is intended to be construed by unlearned folk without a lawyer constantly at their side, the method of legislation of which this Act is so conspicuous an example is, to say the least, extremely inconvenient.

REVIEWS.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Middle Temple Table Talk. With some Talk about the Table itself. By W. G. THORPE, F.S.A., Barrister-at-Law. Hutchinson & Co.

The Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act, 1883. With an Introduction and Notes of all Judicial Decisions under the Act. By ERNEST A. JELF, B.A., Barrister-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

The Parish Councils Guide: Being the Local Government Act, 1894. Together with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes. By HARTLEY B. N. MOTHERSOLE, B.A., LL.B., Barrister-at-Law. Jarrold & Sons.

English Patent Practice. With Acts, Rules, Forms, and Precedents. By HENRY CUNYNGHAME, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Illustrated. William Clowes & Sons (Limited).

Reports of State Trials. New Series. Volume V. (1843 to 1844). Published under the direction of the State Trials Committee. Edited by JOHN E. P. WALLIS, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Eyre & Spottiswoode.

The Local Government Act, 1894 (56 & 57 Vict. c. 73). With Introduction, Notes, and Index. By J. M. LELY and W. F. CRAIGES, Barristers-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Court of Appeal.

Re W. HOLLOWAY, Ex parte PALLISTER—No. 1, 14th April.

PRACTICE—ORIGINATING SUMMONS—SUMMONS UNDER SECTION 37 OF THE SOLICITORS ACT, 1843 (6 & 7 VICT. c. 73)—R. S. C., LXXI., 1; LIV., 4b, 4c, 4d, APPENDIX K.

This was an appeal by W. Holloway from an order of a divisional court. Holloway had been retained by J. Pallister as his solicitor to conduct certain litigation for him, and he claimed a right, in the exercise of his lien as a solicitor, to retain certain papers belonging to Pallister and relating to the litigation until his costs should be paid. Pallister thereupon took out a summons, under section 37 of the Solicitors Act, 1843, for the delivery up of the said papers. The summons was in the ordinary form, being intitled “In the High Court of Justice, Queen’s Bench Division. In the matter of William Holloway, one of the Solicitors of the Supreme Court.” It called upon all parties concerned to attend before the master at chambers upon an application on the part of J. Pallister that the above-named William Holloway should, within four days after service of the order to be made therein, deliver up on oath to the applicant’s present solicitors all deeds, papers, and writings whatsoever in his custody or power belonging to the applicant, and that the said William Holloway should be ordered to pay the costs of the application. The master, being satisfied that the solicitor had given an undertaking to deliver up the papers, made an order as prayed for in the summons. An application on the part of Holloway to set this order aside was refused by Grantham, J., at chambers, and afterwards by the Divisional Court (Mathew and Cave, J.J.). Holloway appealed to the Court of Appeal. It was contended on his behalf that the summons on which the master’s order had been made was invalid. Since the coming into operation of the Rules of 1883 every summons, except a summons taken out in an action already pending, must be an originating summons, and the practice with regard to originating summonses was now governed by the new Rules of November, 1893. By ord. 71, r. 1, of the rules of 1883, “originating summons” was defined to mean “a summons by which proceedings are commenced without writ.” The effect of that was that all proceedings must now be commenced either by writ of summons or by originating summons. The making of an application like the present, under section 37 of the Solicitors Act, clearly constituted proceedings, and the taking out of a summons, if a summons were taken out, was the commencement of those proceedings; for they did not form part of any pending action. Therefore, unless the client chose to adopt the course of issuing a writ and bringing an action, the only other course open to him was to proceed by originating summons. Any doubt as to whether originating summonses applied to the Queen’s Bench Division was now cleared away by the new

Rules of November, 1893 (ord. 54, rr. 4b, 4c, 4d, and Appendix K), which distinctly contemplated the procedure of originating summonses as being applicable to all divisions, and which further gave the defendant or respondent eight days after service of the summons for entering an appearance. The applicant, by taking out an ordinary summons instead of an originating summons, had deprived the solicitor of the benefit of the new rules. Ord. 55, r. 2 (15), was cited, and reference was made to the schedule to the order as to the Supreme Court Fees, 1884, which spoke of “issuing an originating summons under the Act 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, for the taxation of a solicitor’s bill of costs,” &c.: Annual Practice, vol. 2, p. 206.

THE COURT (LORD ESHER, M.R., and LINDLEY, LOPES, KAY, A. L. SMITH, and DAVEY, L.J.J.) dismissed the appeal.

LORD ESHER, M.R., said that a summons under section 37 of the Solicitors Act, 1843, was not an originating summons at all. The framers of the rules of 1883, when they gave a definition of “originating summons,” did not perhaps use the happiest language for expressing their meaning; but they clearly meant by it that mode of commencing an action which was then allowed in addition to or instead of commencing an action by writ. The phrase was then used and well understood in the Chancery Division, though it was not used in the Queen’s Bench Division. In Chancery all suits were originally commenced by bill, but that was an expensive process, and a cheaper and shorter process was invented, in which, in cases where the judge thought fit, a dispute between parties might be determined, and that process was commenced by what was called an originating summons. It was desired to introduce this procedure into the Queen’s Bench Division. But it was clear from the language of the rules relating to originating summonses that they did not apply to such proceedings as the present. It was impossible to suppose that the provision as to entering an appearance within eight days was intended to be applied to a proceeding calling upon a solicitor to have his bill of costs taxed or to deliver up papers. A summons taken out for such a purpose might be originating in form, but it was not originating in nature, inasmuch as it dealt with and arose out of previous proceedings of some sort. The law with regard to the procedure on such a summons was not intended to be interfered with by the introduction of originating summonses, but still remained in its original simplicity and efficacy.

LINDLEY, L.J., said that in 1852 a simplification was made in chancery procedure, by which in certain cases a suit might be commenced by what was called a summons originating in chambers. This expression was afterwards shortened into originating summons. The rules of 1875 as a body did not apply to the Chancery Division. But the rules of 1883 were framed for the purpose of applying to all the divisions, and accordingly included a definition of originating summons. The number of cases to which an originating summons was applicable by degrees increased, instances being given in order 55, but, in all cases where the area of originating summonses was extended, the intention was to allow that to be done by originating summons which previously could have been done by bill or writ of summons. A summons under the Solicitors Act, 1843, could not be called an originating summons; and the expression used in the order as to fees must be taken to be a mistake. The rules of 1893, by order 54A, extended originating summonses to the Queen’s Bench Division; and the additions which were made to order 54 were for the purpose of working in the new order 54A.

LOPES, L.J., concurred.

KAY, L.J., said there were three kinds of summonses—first, summonses taken out in proceedings already existing—i.e., ordinary summonses; secondly, summonses taken out for the purpose of originating an action, which would otherwise be commenced by writ; and thirdly, there was a class of summonses, within which the present case came, which initiated proceedings, not being intitled in any existing action, but which at the same time did not commence an action. He came to the conclusion that this last kind of summons was not included in the term “originating summons” as used in the rules.

A. L. SMITH, L.J., agreed. He said that ord. 71, r. 1, of the rules of 1883 defined “originating summons” as being “a summons by which proceedings are commenced without writ.” He read that as meaning a summons by which proceedings were commenced without writ which might otherwise have been commenced by writ. He thought it did not include a summons which commenced proceedings which could not have been commenced by writ.

DAVEY, L.J., concurred.—COUNSEL, *Newson*; *Tindal Atkinson*, Q.C., and *W. Howland Jackson*. SOLICITORS, *W. Holloway*; *Leesmith & Munby*.

[Reported by F. G. RUCKER, Barrister-at-Law.]

Re LUMLEY—No. 2, 11th April.

PRACTICE—COSTS—WRIT OF SEQUESTRATION—R. S. C., XLIII., 7.

Appeal from an order of North, J. This was an application by Mrs. Cathcart to set aside an order of North, J., refusing to rescind an order made in chambers on the 15th of January, whereby it was ordered that unless Mrs. Cathcart did within four days after service of the order pay to H. Hood Barrs (assignee of Messrs. Lumley) the several sums of £32 10s. 4d., £32 15s. 4d., and £49 15s. 6d., in respect of taxed costs, a writ of sequestration should issue against the separate estate of Mrs. Cathcart not subject to restraint on anticipation, and that the costs of the application should be taxed and paid by Mrs. Cathcart within four days after service of the taxing master’s certificate, and that in default of payment the said Hood Barrs should be at liberty to issue a writ of sequestration against the said separate estate of Mrs. Cathcart.

THE COURT (LINDLEY, LOPES, and KAY, L.J.J.) dismissed the appeal.

LINDLEY, L.J., said that the form of the order, apart from the merits, was obviously wrong. It was not competent to any judge to make an order for sequestration or attachment dependent on a future uncertain

event. He could not make such an order before the order for payment had been disobeyed. To make such an order as this conditionally was not according to law. If that were all that had to be considered the order would be set aside, but that was not all. Their lordships had made inquiries, and had ascertained that the learned judge of the court below had intended to give leave to issue the writ of sequestration then and there, but as a matter of concession to give Mrs. Cathcart four days' grace. The proper way in which to effect that would have been to direct that the order should not be drawn up, or that it should lie in the office for four days, but by an inadvertence this four-day order was engrafed on the order giving leave to issue the writ of sequestration. The question then arose, Had North, J., jurisdiction to order the writ to issue immediately without making any order limiting the time of payment to four days? His lordship then read ord. 42, r. 6, and ord. 43, r. 6, and said that the common practice formerly was to issue a subpoena for costs, there being no limit of time fixed within which payment was to be made, and on proof of service of the subpoena and proof of nonpayment the writ would issue. That had now been altered by ord. 43, r. 7, which provided that "no subpoena for the payment of costs, and, unless by leave of the court or a judge, no sequestration to enforce such order shall be allowed." Taking into consideration the above rules and the old practice, his lordship was of opinion that the judge had jurisdiction to give leave to issue a writ of sequestration without making any four-day order limiting the time in which payment must be made. The order would not, therefore, be discharged, but would be varied by the four-day order being struck out, when it would become simply an order giving leave to issue a writ of sequestration. There would be no order as to costs.

LORRIS, L.J., in concurring, said that, in his opinion, it was only necessary to deal with ord. 43, r. 7, which abolished the whole former practice. Under the old practice no time used to be limited for the payment of the costs, and no limit of time need now be fixed under the new practice. North, J., had power, therefore, to give leave for the writ to issue immediately.

KAY, L.J., concurred.—SOLICITOR, H. Hood Barrs.

[Reported by C. F. DUNCAN, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Chancery Division.

Re **REBECK, BENNETT & REBECK**—Chitty, J., 27th February and 11th April.

WILL—DEVISE OF LANDS CHARGED WITH LEGACY—EXECUTORS' POWER OF SALE.

A testator who died in 1869 bequeathed a legacy to his executors on certain trusts, and declared that his real estate should stand charged with so much thereof as his personal estate should be unable to bear. The residuary devise, who was one of the executors, mortgaged the real estate during the lifetime of his co-executor. The personal estate being insufficient to pay the legacy, this action was brought to have it raised out of the realty in priority to the mortgage. As there was a devise in fee to a beneficiary, the case was expressly excepted from the 16th section of Lord St. Leonards' Act (22 & 23 Vict. c. 35), which gives executors power to sell where a testator has charged his real estate with the payment of "any legacy or other specific sum of money," and has not devised it to trustees (see the latter part of section 18). Counsel for the mortgagee relied on *Corner v. Cartwright* (L. R. 7 H. L. 731, 24 W. R. Dig. 311), and contended that by virtue of the charge the devise being also an executor, could sell and give a good discharge for the purchase-money. Counsel for the legatee contended that, apart from a general charge of debts as in *Corner v. Cartwright*, executors could neither sell nor give a good discharge for the proceeds of sale of real estate: *Williams on Real Assets*, p. 61. The devisee *quid* devisee could clearly only sell subject to the charge.

CHITTY, J.—The short point was this: "Devise in fee of lands charged with a particular legacy. Had the executors power to sell?" It was an extraordinary thing that counsel had been unable to cite any text-book of repute in favour of such a proposition. Every charge of a pecuniary legacy on real estate was a charge in aid of the personal estate, so that nothing turned on the words "so much thereof as his personal estate should be unable to bear." The question as to an executor's power of sale had been before the court for a very considerable time, and had been the subject of continual discussion. Where there was a general charge of debts the executors had not only a power of sale, but also a right to give a good discharge for the purchase-money. This was for "the great convenience of mankind" (*Colyer v. Finch*, 5 H. L. Cas. 905, 923, 5 W. R. Dig. 255), as it was absurd that the purchaser should be involved in the administration of the estate. But another case had also been before the courts—viz., the case where land was devised charged with a scheduled debt or a particular legacy. In such a case the above reason did not apply. In *Horn v. Horn* (2 Sim. & St. 448), where legacies alone were charged, the purchaser from a sole executor devisee was held bound to see to the application of the purchase-money, and the rule was so stated by Lord Lyndhurst in *Johnson v. Kennett* (3 My. & K. 624, 630). The special ground of exemption did not apply where the purchaser only had to look at the will and ascertain the sums to be paid and the persons to whom they were payable. It was plain in such cases that the legatee must concur if the purchaser was to get a good discharge. No authority had been produced for the proposition that an executor could sell real estate where it was only charged with the payment of a legacy, and it was not for his lordship to create a new power of sale in 1894. There was no difference between a charge by contract and a charge by will. If a man deposited deeds by way of mortgage neither the mortgagor nor the mort-

gagee had a power of sale. Similarly if land was devised charged with the payment of a sum other than a legacy, there was no power of sale in anybody. Of course, the testator's will might show that he intended a power of sale to be given, but that case did not arise here. Lord St. Leonards' Act did not apply, and the purchaser or mortgagee in this case had no title against the legatee, whose legacy was charged on the land.—COUNSEL, *Levett, Q.C.*, and *Peterson; Farwell, Q.C.*, and *Dauney*. SOLICITORS, *Nash, Field, & Co.*; *W. D. Dowding*.

[Reported by G. ROWLAND ALSTON, Barrister-at-Law.]

WALKER v. THE LAMBETH WATERWORKS CO.—Chitty, J., 10th and 11th April.

WATER—WATER RATE—EXTRA CHARGE—PRIVATE ACT—DOMESTIC PURPOSES—BATH—LAMBETH WATERWORKS ACT, 1848 (11 VICT. C. VII.), s. 39.

Special case. Under section 37 of the Lambeth Waterworks Act, 1848, the Lambeth Water Co. were bound to supply water for domestic purposes at certain specified rates. Under section 38 they were empowered to supply water for purposes other than domestic purposes at rates to be agreed upon. Section 39 provided that a supply of water for domestic purposes should not include a supply of water for baths, horses, cattle, or for washing carriages, or for any trade or business whatsoever. The company were accustomed to charge 10s. for a fixed bath supplied direct from the main, but made no charge for movable baths. The plaintiff claimed a supply for his fixed bath, which had such a direct supply, contending that it was included under the ordinary charge for domestic purposes, and that the special charge was illegal, the exceptions in section 39 being only applicable to public baths, or to some establishment of horses, or trade or business of washing carriages: *Weaver v. Corporation of Cardiff* (48 L. T. 906, 31 W. R. Dig. 215), where the words were "a supply of water for domestic purposes shall not include a supply for railway purposes, or for baths, wash-houses, or public purposes, or for horses or cattle, or for washing carriages, &c., &c., or for any trade, manufacture, or business whatsoever."

CHITTY, J., said it was absurd to suppose that the Legislature would enact that a supply of water for domestic purposes should not include a supply for public purposes. There might have been absurdities in some of these Acts of Parliament, but his lordship was not bound to import one into the Act before him. The section was evidently meant to exclude something which, but for the exclusion, would have been a domestic purpose. There was no ground for any limitation of the following words as to "horses or washing carriages." In *Bushy v. The Chesterfield Waterworks Co.* (E. B. & E. 176) where there was nothing special in the Company's Act Lord Campbell decided that "domestic uses" included a supply for a horse and carriage kept for private use. That decision was in point because the exclusion of "baths" in section 39 was coupled with the exclusion of something else which, according to Lord Campbell's decision, would *prima facie* be included under the head of domestic purposes. Again the concluding words were "for any trade or business whatsoever," not "for any other trade or business whatsoever." The Legislature had carefully omitted the word "other." It was suggested that this was imperfect drafting, but his lordship was not prepared to say so, as he thought there might be trades or businesses carried on in private dwelling-houses the occupiers of which would still be entitled to a supply for domestic purposes. It was argued that the word baths if applied to private baths must include all private baths, both fixed and movable. The practical difference in the amount of water used was palpable, but the question did not arise because the company never sought to charge movable baths, and his lordship's observations as to them were extra judicial. His lordship also refused to enter into the question of a fixed bath without a direct supply.—COUNSEL, *Byrne, Q.C.*, and *W. F. Hamilton; Sir Richard Webster, Q.C.*, *Farwell, Q.C.*, and *Yate Lee*. SOLICITORS, *H. C. Morris; Bell, Stewards, May, & How*.

[Reported by G. ROWLAND ALSTON, Barrister-at-Law.]

Re **CAHILL, LOGAN v. CAHILL**—Chitty, J., 12th and 13th April.

WILL—GIFT TO TESTATOR'S NEXT OF KIN AT DEATH OF A THIRD PERSON—DEATH OF SUCH THIRD PERSON BEFORE TESTATOR—FAILURE OF GIFT.

Bequest to testator's sister E. T. for life, with an ultimate trust for "such person or persons as, at the time of the decease of the said E. T., would be my own next of kin and entitled to my personal estate under the statutes for the distribution of the estates of intestates, such persons, if more than one, to take distributively according to the said statutes." E. T. predeceased the testator, so that at his death it became necessary to decide who were entitled under the ultimate trust. The testator's statutory next of kin claimed, on the ground that the construction must be the same as if E. T. had survived the testator, in which case the next of kin at the testator's death who survived E. T. would have taken. Here all the next of kin survived E. T. The claim was resisted by the residuary legatee, on the ground that the maxim "*Nemo est heres viventis*" applied to personality, so that no persons could have been statutory next of kin of the testator at the death of E. T.: *Re Parsons* (38 W. R. 712, 45 Ch. D. 51).

CHITTY, J., said that the words "as at the death of E. T." formed part of the description of the class, and the effect of the next of kin's contention was to strike them out. The statutory next of kin who were ascertainable at the testator's death could not have been his statutory next of kin at the death of E. T.—i.e., while he was alive. The claim of the next of kin failed, and the legacy fell into residue.—COUNSEL, *F. D. Blake; Yate Lee, Micklem*. SOLICITORS, *R. Plus, Leadbitter, & Peterson*, for *Sanderson & Weatherhead*, Berwick.

[Reported by G. ROWLAND ALSTON, Barrister-at-Law.]

Re PINHORNE, MORETON v. HUGHES—Chitty, J., 17th April.
WILL—CONSTRUCTION—GIFT TO NAMED PERSONS—"SHARE OF EACH OF MY SISTERS"—SETTLEMENT OF SHARES—LAPSE.

This was a summons by the plaintiffs, the executors and trustees appointed by the will of the above-named testator, for the determination of a question arising in the administration of his estate. By his will, dated in 1885, the testator gave his residuary real and personal estate to the plaintiffs upon trust for sale and conversion, and directed them to stand possessed of the moneys remaining after certain payments thereout, and the investments representing the same (therein called the residuary trust funds) in trust as follows—viz., "for my four sisters, Evelyn Hughes, Florence Pinhorne, Cecil Kerr, and Adela Pinhorne, in equal shares: Provided always and I declare that my trustees shall retain the shares of each of my sisters of and in the residuary trust funds upon the trusts following—that is to say, upon trust to pay the income thereof to my same sister during her life without power of anticipation, but with power nevertheless for my same sister to appoint by deed or will that after her decease the whole or any part of such income shall be paid to any husband of her who may survive her during his life or any less period: And, from and after the decease of my same sister and subject to any appointment . . . to her husband . . . in trust for the children of my same sister who being male shall attain the age of twenty-one years, or being female shall attain that age or marry, in equal shares. . . . And I direct that, in case my same sister shall die without leaving a child who shall attain a vested interest in the said residuary trust funds, then after the death of my same sister and such failure of her issue, her share in the residuary trust funds shall (subject to any interest appointed to her husband . . .) be held in trust for the persons . . . who under the statutes of distribution of the effects of intestates would be entitled thereto in case my same sister had died possessed thereof intestate and without having been married." The testator died in October, 1892, and his will was proved by the plaintiffs in June, 1893. Evelyn Hughes predeceased the testator, having died in August, 1885, leaving a husband and three infant children, who were now living. The question was, whether there was an intestacy as to the one-fourth share bequeathed in trust for Evelyn Hughes and her children. For an intestacy the cases relied on were *Stewart v. Jones* (7 W. R. 184, 3 De G. & J. 532) and *Re Roberts, Tareton v. Bruton* (32 W. R. 986, 27 Ch. D. 346, and on appeal, 30 Ch. D. 234). *Contra* the cases of *Re Potter's Trusts* (L. R. 8 Eq. 52, 17 W. R. Ch. Dig. 186), *Unsworth v. Speakman* (25 W. R. 225, 4 Ch. D. 620), and 2 Jarman, 5th ed., p. 1576, were referred to.

CHITTY, J., said that the argument for an intestacy was that there was an absolute gift of one-fourth share. That was followed by a settlement affecting only what was taken under the gift. Evelyn Hughes, having died in the testator's lifetime, took no interest under the gift to her, so that as to her share there was nothing for the settlement to operate upon, and in consequence an intestacy. It was pertinent to ask what interest Evelyn would have taken if she had survived the testator. The only possible answer was that she would have taken a life interest. The trust for the testator's four sisters in equal shares did not stand alone. It was followed immediately by a proviso and declaration. The trusts declared exhausted the whole beneficial interest. The effect was that Evelyn took only a life interest in the one-fourth share. What was the meaning of "share of each of my sisters" in the proviso? It meant the one-fourth share in which, on the just construction of the will, each of those sisters took a life interest only. The proviso cut down the absolute interest first given. The result was that the first trust was merely intended to effect a division into four shares. There was no difficulty in interpreting "share of each of my sisters" to mean the share which I shewed by my will that I did not intend for her, except in the way shewn, so that she took for life only. Therefore the death of Evelyn had not displaced the trusts of the share. As for the cases, *Stewart v. Jones* was distinguishable as a case of a class gift, and also by the terms of the settlement made there, and *Re Roberts* by the divesting clause following the gift. His lordship therefore held that there was no intestacy as to the share, and that the infant children of Evelyn Hughes were contingently entitled to the share under the will.—COUNSEL, *A. Underhill*; *Badcock*; *C. Macnaghten*. SOLICITORS, *Ullithorne, Currey, & Fildes*, for Neve, Cresswell, & Sparrow, Wolverhampton; *Crouders & Vizard*, for Shaw & King, Birmingham; *Bower, Cotton, & Bower*, for Radford, Gill, & Radford, Manchester.

[Reported by J. F. WALRY, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Queen's Bench Division.

HEATH AND OTHERS v. OVERSEERS OF WEAVERHAM—13th April.
RATING—HIGHWAY—EXEMPTION BY REASON OF DUTY OR LIABILITY—EXTINCTION OF LIABILITY—DETERMINATION OF EXEMPTION—HIGHWAY ACT, 1835 (5 & 6 WILL. 4, c. 50), s. 33.

This was an appeal by way of special case by consent against a poor rate for the township of Weaverham, in the county of Chester. The appellants were the owner and occupiers of Hefferston Grange and certain farms belonging thereto, in the hamlet of Gorstage, in the above township—which hamlet had from time immemorial separately maintained its own highways. The owners and occupiers of Hefferston Grange had from time immemorial been liable *ratione tenuræ* to repair a road called Grange-lane in the above hamlet, and have, in consequence of such liability, been exempt from repairing, and have never repaired or contributed to the repairs of the other highways in such hamlet. The occupiers of Hefferston Grange had always been rated for the relief of the poor of the township of Weaverham. In 1866 the

Court of Queen's Bench (14 W. R. 388, L. R. 1 Q. B. 218) quashed a rate which had been made upon the appellant or other occupiers of Hefferston Grange so far as it extended to the repairs of highways in the township of Weaverham, including the hamlet of Gorstage. By 22 Geo. 3, c. 106 certain trustees were appointed for the purpose of repairing and widening a certain road, which included Grange-lane, and constituting it a turnpike road. By 4 Geo. 4, c. 82 the above Act was repealed, and in lieu thereof the enacting statute incorporating the provisions of the General Turnpike Act, 3 Geo. 4, c. 126, was substituted. During the continuance of the above trust the trustees widened and altered Grange-lane to a considerable extent, and in 1862 the trust expired and the appellants resumed repairing Grange-lane. In 1892 the County Council of Chester, upon the application of the appellants, who contended that in consequence of the alterations effected by the trustees they were no longer liable to repair it, declared Grange-lane a main road, which the appellants thereupon ceased to repair. In 1893 the appellants were included in a rate made for the repair of the highways generally in the township, and by consent a case was stated for the opinion of the court as to their liability. The appellants contended that having once been exempt from contributing to the repairs of the highways in the above township, by reason of their liability *ratione tenuræ* of Hefferston Grange to repair Grange-lane, such exemption was not determined in law by the fact that their liability to repair Grange-lane had now ceased. They also contended that after the decision of the court in 1864 the matter was *res judicata*. The respondents contended that when the liability *ratione tenuræ* of the appellants to repair was extinguished, the exemption also ceased; and contended further that the decision in 1864 was based upon the assumption that the appellants were liable to repair Grange-lane. By section 33 of the Highway Act (5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 50) it was enacted that "when property, or the owner in respect thereof, has been legally exempted from the performance of statute duty, or from the payment of any composition in lieu thereof, or of any highway rate, the said property, and the owners or occupiers thereof, shall be exempt from the payment of the rate hereby imposed."

THE COURT (CHARLES and COLLINS, JJ.) dismissed the appeal. The question turned upon the construction of section 33 of the Highway Act of 1835, and it was clear that where persons were at the date of that Act liable *ratione tenuræ* to certain repairs, and were exempt in consequence from certain liabilities to other repairs, such exemption was continued under the Act. But the words were "legally exempted." Since the passing of the Act, the liability of the appellants to repair Grange-lane had ceased, and the appellants did not, therefore, come within the ambit of the exemption. *Cessante ratione cessat ipsa lex*, and in the opinion of the court only those who were called upon to perform a duty or undertake a liability in respect of it could claim the exemption, and in the present case, the reason of the exemption having disappeared, the exemption also must cease.—COUNSEL, *Poland, Q.C.*, and *Alexander Glen*; *F. Marshall, Q.C.*, and *H. Lloyd*. SOLICITORS, *Roscliffes, Rawle, & Co.*, for Ashton & Woods, Warrington; *Taylor, Hoare, & Taylor*, for A. & I. E. Fletcher, Northwich.

[Reported by J. P. MELLOR, Barrister-at-Law.]

REG. v. MEAD (METROPOLITAN POLICE MAGISTRATE)—13th and 14th April.

PUBLIC HEALTH (LONDON) ACT, 1891 (54 & 55 VICT. c. 76), s. 120, SUB-SECTION 4; s. 128, SUB-SECTION 1—NUISANCE—SUMMONS—DESIGNATION OF OWNER OF PREMISES—"NOTICE, ORDER, OR OTHER DOCUMENT"—SERVICE OF SUMMONS.

Rule nisi to Mr. Mead, metropolitan police magistrate, to shew cause why he should not hear and determine a complaint of nuisance. The question in the case was whether a summons under the Public Health (London) Act, 1891, must be addressed to the owner of the premises in respect of which the complaint arose by name and served upon him personally, as required by Jervis' Act, or whether under the provisions of the above Act of 1891 it is sufficient if it be addressed to the "owner" of and left for him upon the premises. A summons was taken out by the sanitary inspector for the Poplar district against the owner of certain premises for allowing them to be in such a state as to create a nuisance. The learned magistrate, however, declined jurisdiction, on the ground that, the summons not having been addressed to the owner of the premises by name or served upon him personally, but addressed to the owner of the premises and left with some person found thereon for him, was informal and improperly served. By the Public Health (London) Act, 1891 (54 & 55 Vict. c. 76), s. 120, sub-section 4, "whenever in any proceeding under the provisions of this Act relating to nuisances it becomes necessary to mention or refer to the owner or occupier of any premises, it shall be sufficient to designate him as the 'owner' or 'occupier' of such premises without further name or description." By section 128, sub-section 1, it is provided that "any notice, order, or other document required or authorized to be served under this Act may be served by delivering the same or a true copy thereof, &c. . . . or when addressed to the owner or occupier of premises, then to some person on the premises, or if there is no person on the premises who can be so served, then by fixing the same or a copy thereof on some conspicuous part of the premises," &c. It was contended by counsel in shewing cause that a summons was not a "notice, order, or other document" within the provisions of section 128, sub-section 1, which together with section 127 was headed "notices" in the Act, and referred only to notices or documents authorized by the Act to be issued by the sanitary authority or the county council, and not to notices or orders issued by a court of summary jurisdiction. Such a document must be served in accordance within the provisions of Jervis' Act, and must be addressed to the owner by name and served upon him personally. By section 116, sub-section 3, of the Act express provision was made in the case of the owner of

premises being unknown by the enactment that when the occupier wilfully refused to disclose the name of the owner he should be liable to a penalty. It was argued by counsel in support of the rule that the provisions of the Act expressly allowed a summons to be addressed to and served upon the owner of premises without designating him by name or serving him personally in order to obviate the difficulties of doing so in crowded neighbourhoods. Without such provisions it would be frequently impossible to administer the Act, and if section 120, sub-section 4, did not apply to a summons it would be useless. The practical result of the mode of service contended for was almost invariably that the owner appeared. But if he did not do so the court of summary jurisdiction could not proceed to fine and conviction, although by virtue of section 8 an order could in that case be made upon the sanitary authority to abate the nuisance. By virtue of section 120, sub-section 4, the summons sufficiently designated the owner by so describing him, and such summons was clearly an "other document" within the meaning of section 128, sub-section 1.

THE COURT (CHARLES and COLLINS, JJ.) made the rule absolute. It was clear upon a reference to the provisions of the Act that a summons was included in the words "notice, order, or other document" in sub-section 1 of section 128, and could consequently be properly served in the manner provided by that section. It was also sufficient in such a proceeding as was taken in this case to designate the owner of premises as the "owner" as provided by section 120, sub-section 4, instead of naming him, and no injustice would arise from such a course, because no conviction or fine could follow unless the owner were designated, although by virtue of section 8 a nuisance order could then be addressed to and executed by the sanitary authority.—COUNSEL, H. Sutton; Muir. SOLICITORS, Solicitor to the Treasury; C. V. Young & Son.

[Reported by J. P. MELLOR, Barrister-at-Law.]

TOMLINSON v. HAMPSON—16th April.

COUNTY COURT—MONEY PAID INTO COURT TO ABIDE THE JUDGMENT—RIGHT TO PAYMENT OUT.

The question in this case was whether the plaintiff was entitled to have paid out to him a sum of £60 which had been paid into court on behalf of a defendant against whom a petition in bankruptcy had been presented before the plaintiff obtained judgment. On the 2nd of February the plaintiff issued a summons in the county court to recover summarily a sum alleged to be due to him on a promissory note. On the 5th of February the county court judge made an order on the application *ex parte* of the plaintiff that the defendant should pay to a receiver a sum of £60 "to abide the judgment or order of the court." On the 7th of February that sum was paid to the receiver, and by him to the registrar of the court. On the 9th of February a petition in bankruptcy was presented against the defendant. On the 14th of February the plaintiff obtained judgment against the defendant. An application by the plaintiff for payment out to him of the sum of £60 so paid into court was opposed by the official receiver and refused by the county court judge. The plaintiff appealed, and argued that by the form of the order for payment in, the sum was paid in to abide the event of the action, and that the plaintiff, upon obtaining judgment, was entitled to have it paid out to him: *Ex parte Banner* (L. R. 9 Ch. 379), *Ex parte Bouchard* (12 Ch. D. 26); section 45 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, had no application to an order of this kind: *Re Hutchinson* (16 Q. B. D. 515). On behalf of the official receiver, *Re Potts* (1893, 1 Q. B. 648), *Re Dickinson* (22 Q. B. D. 187), and *Butler v. Wearing* (17 Q. B. D. 182) were cited, and it was argued that section 45 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, applied, and had altered the law since *Re Banner* was decided; also, that the decision in that case did not govern the present case, in which the order for payment into court was made *ex parte*.

THE COURT (CHARLES and COLLINS, JJ.) allowed the appeal.

CHARLES, J.—I think we have no alternative but to allow this appeal. The county court judge ordered that this sum was to be paid "to abide the judgment or order of the court in this action." Twelve days after the summons was issued the plaintiff signed judgment, and he claims that, the event of the action having been in his favour, he is entitled to have the money paid out to him. I cannot see any distinction between this case and the cases of *Ex parte Banner* and *Ex parte Bouchard*. There is no doubt that the judge had jurisdiction to make the order which he made, and I think the result of it is the same as that of the orders in those cases. It is true that in *Ex parte Banner* the application was by the debtor, and here it is by the creditor; but that cannot make any difference in the terms of this order. The appeal must be allowed.

COLLINS, J.—I am of the same opinion. The result of the authorities is that, where money is paid into court to abide the event of an action which is not decided for several days afterwards, the money must be considered as protected from the date of its payment in. The order was certainly made *ex parte*, but there was jurisdiction to make it. The money was paid in to abide the event, and I think this case is covered by *Banner's* and *Bouchard's* cases. Appeal allowed.—COUNSEL, E. W. Hansell; Trevor Lloyd. SOLICITORS, Kennedy, Hughes, & Kennedy; Field, Roscoe, & Co., for Hugh Jones, Oswestry.

[Reported by T. R. C. DILL, Barrister-at-Law.]

Solicitors' Cases.

KENT v. WARD—C. A. No. 1, 10th April.

SOLICITOR—BILL OF COSTS—TAXATION—UNCERTIFICATED SOLICITOR—DISBURSEMENTS—RIGHT TO RECOVER—SOLICITORS ACT, 1874 (37 & 38 VICT. c. 68), s. 12.

Appeal from an order of the Queen's Bench Division. The plaintiff, a

solicitor, was retained by the defendant to conduct an action in the High Court for him. By section 22 of the Solicitors Act, 1880 (23 & 24 VICT. c. 127), every solicitor's certificate issued by the registrar between the 15th of November and the 16th of December in any year shall bear date on the 16th of November, and shall take effect on that day for all purposes; and every certificate issued at any other time shall bear date on the day on which it is issued, and shall take effect on the day on which it is stamped; and every certificate shall continue in force from the day on which it takes effect until the 15th of November following. Between the 16th of November and the 31st of December, 1892, the plaintiff delivered two briefs to counsel in the action, and the action was tried within that period, and two refresher fees became due to counsel in respect thereof. The plaintiff in that year omitted to take out his certificate until the 31st of December. On the 20th of February, 1893, the plaintiff paid counsel the brief fees and the refresher fees. The plaintiff delivered his bill of costs, which, after giving credit for money paid to him on account of the general expenses of the action, shewed a balance of £124 due to him, and brought this action to recover that amount. At the trial Mathew, J., gave judgment for the amount claimed subject to taxation. At the taxation the master refused to tax off the above-mentioned brief and refresher fees, and the defendant carried in objections to the allowance of these items upon the ground that by section 12 of the Solicitors Act, 1874, they were not recoverable. The judge at chambers and the Divisional Court (Mathew and Cave, JJ.) dismissed an application to review the taxation upon the ground that the plaintiff had a right to appropriate the money in his hands to the payment of those items. The defendant appealed. By section 74 of the Solicitors Act, 1874, "No costs, fee, reward, or disbursement on account of or in relation to any act or proceeding done or taken by any person who acts as an attorney or solicitor without being duly qualified so to act shall be recoverable in any action, suit, or matter by any person or persons whomsoever. For the purposes of this section a person shall be deemed to be duly qualified to act as an attorney or solicitor if he shall have in force at the time at which he acts as an attorney or solicitor a duly stamped certificate authorizing him so to do."

THE COURT (LORD ESHER, M.R., A. L. SMITH and DAVEY, L.JJ.) allowed the appeal.

LORD ESHER, M.R., said that the meaning of the judgment for the plaintiff at the trial was that he should have judgment for that amount which upon taxation he was found to be entitled to. The plaintiff in this case delivered briefs in an action at a time when he had not taken out his certificate. It was true that a solicitor had a month's grace from the 16th of November in which to take out his certificate, and if he took it out within the month the certificate dated back to the 16th of November. But if he allowed the month's grace to expire without taking out his certificate, the certificate would be dated on the day on which it was issued, and would not relate back. In such a case during the time when he had no certificate he would not be duly qualified to act as a solicitor. The acts done by the plaintiff on account of which he made the disbursements were done by him at a time when he was an uncertificated solicitor, and therefore not duly qualified to act as a solicitor. No doubt the disbursements were made when the plaintiff had taken out his certificate, but they were made on account of acts done by him when he was uncertificated. Section 12 of the Solicitors Act, 1874, therefore prevented him from recovering them. It was then said that, though the plaintiff might not recover them in the action, yet as the defendant had paid him money generally on account of his costs, he could allocate part of that money to the payment of these items. In his lordship's opinion a solicitor had no right to allocate money to the payment of items which he was not entitled to recover. But, supposing he could so allocate the money, it was clear from the facts that the plaintiff never did so allocate it. Therefore the items objected to must be disallowed, and the appeal succeeded.

A. L. SMITH, L.J., in concurring, said that it was not necessary to say whether a solicitor could allocate money received from his client generally to the payment of items which he could not recover, because it was clear that the plaintiff here never did so allocate the money.

DAVEY, L.J., concurred. The act or proceeding on account of which these payments for the brief and refresher fees were made was the delivery of the briefs. To his lordship's mind the refresher fees became due, in the sense in which counsel's fees ever did become due, upon the delivery of the briefs, subject to the condition taking place which would entitle counsel to be paid the refresher fees. But whether that be so or whether the refresher fees became due at the time when the trial lasted the requisite time was immaterial in this case, because in either event the plaintiff had not then taken out his certificate. Therefore by section 12 of the Solicitors Act, 1874, the brief and refresher fees were not recoverable in the action. As regards the question of allocation, it was unnecessary to decide whether the plaintiff could do so or not. He was disposed to agree with the Master of the Rolls that a solicitor could not allocate to the payment of items which were not recoverable money paid to him generally by the client. Here, however, it was too late for the plaintiff now to attempt to make the allocation, as it was clear that he had never hitherto made it nor even dreamt of making it.—COUNSEL, Marshall, Q.C., and George Wallace; Muir Mackenzie. SOLICITORS, H. S. Bridge; Rossiter.

[Reported by W. F. BARRY, Barrister-at-Law.]

County Courts.

HIGLEY v. REYNOLDS & PHILLIPS—Hereford, 10th April.

LESSOR'S SOLICITOR'S COSTS—CUSTOM IN HEREFORDSHIRE.

This was an action in which Mrs. Annie Higley sued Messrs. Reynolds & Phillips for £2 12s. 6d., a moiety of the lessor's solicitors' costs for a lease

of premises in the city of Hereford granted by the plaintiff to the defendants.

Mr. Earle (Messrs. Hutchinson & Earle) appeared for the plaintiff and Mr. Garrold for the defendants.

Mr. Earle, in opening the case, stated that the facts (which were admitted) were briefly these:—The plaintiff granted a lease to the defendants without any reference having been made in the course of the negotiations to the question of costs. She had paid the costs, and now claimed, under a custom in the county of Hereford, repayment by the lessees of one-half the amount. The two points necessary to be proved were, therefore, first, the general law of the land that the lessee pays the whole of the lessor's solicitor's costs in addition to those of his own solicitor, if he employ one; and, secondly, that there is a custom in the county limiting the amount payable by the lessee to one-half. In support of the first contention he relied upon Davidson's Precedents, vol. 5, part 1, p. 26 (note); Rubinstein's Conveyancing Costs, p. 89 (note A); the Incorporated Law Society's Digest on the Solicitors' Remuneration Order, pp. 112 and 113, paragraphs Nos. 267, 268, and 269; the case of *Grissell v. Robinson* (3 Bing. N. C. 10); referred to the judgment in *Helps v. Clayton* (13 W. R. 161, 17 C. B. N. S. 553, 34 L. J. C. P. 1, 11 L. T. 476); and in the notes to *Wigglesworth v. Dalton* (Smith's L. C., p. 520). In support of the second point he read a resolution of the Herefordshire Incorporated Law Society, passed in 1888, in the following words:—"That this committee consider that, in the absence of any stipulation to the contrary, it is the universally recognized practice in this part of the country for the costs of the lessor's solicitor to be divided equally between lessor and lessee, and that the lessee pay his own solicitor in addition, if he employ one." Mr. Garrold objected that this was not evidence, but his Honour admitted it on learning that professional evidence was to be called in support. Evidence was then given that the above resolution correctly expressed the custom of the county by Messrs. T. Llanwarne (president of the Herefordshire Incorporated Law Society), J. Gwynne James, W. J. Humphrys, and J. R. Symons (hon. sec. of the Herefordshire Incorporated Law Society), whose experience extended over periods of from thirty to fifty years.

Mr. Garrold argued against both customs that they did not comply with the nine essentials mentioned in Blackstone, and that this was an attempt to set up a custom for Herefordshire imposing upon one man liability to pay the debt of another.

His Honour Judge LEA, in giving judgment for the plaintiff, said that if he had any doubt in the case he would have reserved judgment, but he really could not have the slightest doubt as to what the judgment should be. It had been to his mind proved by a number of authorities, if it really needed to be proved at all, that it was the established rule in London, and in the greater part of the country, that in the case of a lease the lessee paid the costs of the lessee and lessor. For that he had authorities of the best kind, and his own experience was entirely in the same way. It was not asked in the present case that the lessee should pay the whole of the costs, but only half. Solicitors of experience had stated that in this county the custom was, not that the lessee should pay the whole, but only half. He was entirely satisfied with that evidence, upon which he was entitled to rely. He did not think that the rule was established by the resolution of the local law society, which, as had been stated in evidence, was only passed with a view of placing on record a custom which had prevailed for a long time past.

Mr. Garrold applied for time to consider whether his client would ask for leave to appeal or that a case might be stated, but his Honour refused the application, saying that if he gave leave to appeal it would only be on condition that the defendant paid the costs on both sides.

Judgment for plaintiff with costs.

LAW SOCIETIES.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

In pursuance of the resolution passed at the adjourned annual general meeting, held on the 15th of July, 1881, to the effect that meetings of the society should be held in January and April, a special general meeting of the members of the society will be held in the hall of the society on Friday, the 27th inst., at two o'clock precisely, to consider the subject hereinafter mentioned and of which notice has been duly given.

Mr. John Hunter will move on behalf of the council, "That the existing bye-laws be repealed, and that the proposed new bye-laws as adopted by the council be enacted."

NOTE.—On considering the existing bye-laws it appeared to the council that they required re-arrangement, and that some additions and amendments were desirable.

In the print of the proposed new bye-laws all the provisions relating to one subject are, as far as possible arranged under one head, and the headings have been grouped in their logical order. For the convenience of members the numbers of the existing bye-laws and regulations are printed in the margin, and where a bye-law or portion of a bye-law is new, it is indicated as such.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

The fifty-seventh annual general meeting of the Legal and General Life Assurance Society was held on Tuesday, at the offices, 10, Fleet-street, the chair being taken by Mr. WM. WILLIAMS.

The SECRETARY (Mr. E. Colquhoun) having read the notice convening

the meeting, the report, revenue account, and balance-sheet were taken as read.

The CHAIRMAN in moving the adoption of the report and accounts said he hoped the meeting would find the report to be satisfactory. It would be observed that during the past year new assurances had been effected with the society under 575 policies for the sum of £1,119,496. The new premiums thereon had amounted to £38,892 1s. 6d., of which £7,178 3s. 6d. was paid away for the reinsurance with other offices of £391,805, leaving £31,713 18s. as the new premiums on £727,691, the net risks retained by the society. It might be interesting to the meeting to know what were the premiums in the five preceding years. In the year 1893 the premiums were £30,587; in 1892 they were £27,941; in 1890, £26,320; in 1889, £27,571; and in 1888 only £20,517; so that it would be seen that in the course of less than five years the new premiums had increased by more than £11,000. The total net premium income of last year had amounted to £211,542 8s. 6d., being an increase of £16,015 upon that of 1892. The total claims had amounted to £162,988 8s. 6d., whilst the mortality was very much less last year than was to have been expected—viz., £162,988 8s. 6d. against £178,194 of the year 1892. That sum included £40,749 16s. paid as bonus additions to policies assuring £79,020, and in cases in which bonuses had not been previously surrendered for cash or reduction of premium the additions had amounted to the large average increase of 60 per cent. The total number of ordinary policies in force at the end of the year was 5,199, assuring, with bonus additions, £9,618,388. The total assets of the society had increased during the year—and this was a very satisfactory amount—by the sum of £138,582 8s., and they amounted on the 31st of December to £2,831,064 17s. 7d. Omitting the amount invested in the purchase of reversionary interests the remainder of the society's assets, productive and unproductive, had yielded an average rate of £4 6s. 9d. per cent. The assets of the society included £1,805,155 invested on mortgages of real and personal property in the United Kingdom. Of these mortgages only £74,440 was now upon property in Ireland, and this sum was well secured and the interest was punctually paid. The other mortgages, which were upon property in England or Wales, had been recently investigated by the directors, and the result of such investigation was satisfactory.

Mr. F. J. BLAKE seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN said that under the powers conferred by the deed of settlement the directors had filled the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Bartle J. L. Frere by electing his nephew, Mr. George Edgar Frere. Under the provisions of the deed Mr. Frere would retire from office at this meeting, but was eligible for re-election. He hoped, therefore, that Mr. Frere would be re-elected a director, and he moved accordingly.

Mr. BLAKE seconded the motion, which was agreed to *nem. con.*

The CHAIRMAN said that the following gentlemen also retired from office:—Messrs. Blake, A. Grant Meek, Frederic P. Morrell, Wm. Hy. Saltwell, and himself. With the exception of his own name he would move that the other retiring directors be re-elected.

Mr. BLAKE moved that Mr. Wm. Williams be also re-elected a director.

The motions were carried.

The CHAIRMAN said that two of the auditors, Mr. Kenyon C. S. Parker and Mr. John S. Follett, retired in rotation. Both were very well-known names, and gentlemen who had always performed their duty with great satisfaction. They were eligible for re-election, and he begged to propose them.

The motion having been agreed to,

The CHAIRMAN said it was also necessary that the meeting should authorize the directors to remunerate the auditors for their services, which had become very much more onerous in consequence of the increased business of the society. He was sure the annual sum voted for them would be again voted on the present occasion. He moved that it be £200, which was only £50 each.

The vote was adopted.

A vote of thanks to the directors for their conduct of the business of the society and to the chairman for presiding over the meeting having been carried with acclamation,

The CHAIRMAN in returning thanks on behalf of himself and his colleagues, said they were very greatly indebted to the staff, and he begged, therefore, to associate Mr. Colquhoun and the staff in the vote. He was sure they all deserved it. Their work had very much increased, but the result, as the report had shewn, was satisfactory.

UNITED LAW SOCIETY.

April 16—Mr. G. D. Elliman in the chair.—Before the debate was proceeded with, Mr. J. S. Green, as an old member of the society, moved, and Mr. L. W. Browne seconded, the resolution:—"That this house expresses its regret at the deaths of Lords Hannon and Bowen," which was unanimously agreed to. Dr. C. Herbert Smith then moved: "That the Indian Opium Traffic is a discredit to the country, and should be prohibited." He dealt with the subject in an exhaustive way, and supported his arguments by many facts collected by the Anti-Opium Society. Mr. C. W. Williams opposed, and after Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Marks, and Mr. Begg had addressed the house, and Dr. C. Herbert Smith had replied, the motion was put and lost by two votes.

LONDON AND LANCASHIRE FIRE INSURANCE.—The annual accounts shew a net premium income of £868,139, and a net credit balance on the year's operations of £26,453. Dividend (including the interim), 10s. per share, or 20 per cent. on the paid-up capital. The financial position of the company will then stand as follows:—Capital paid up, £212,750; reserve funds, exclusive of capital, £660,359; reserve capital at call of directors, £1,914,750.

NEW ORDERS, &c. TRANSFERS OF ACTIONS.

ORDERS OF COURT.

Monday, the 9th day of April, 1894.

I, Farrer, Baron Herschell, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, do hereby transfer the action of "Heywood and Company (Limited) v. The Furniture Press (Limited)" (1894-H-828) from the Honourable Mr. Justice Stirling to the Honourable Mr. Justice Vaughan Williams.

HERSCHELL, C.

Monday, the 9th day of April, 1894.

I, Farrer, Baron Herschell, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, do hereby transfer the action of "Miles Prendergast Jukes (on behalf of himself and all other persons entitled to the benefit of any Contracts of Insurance or Guarantee by the National Insurance and Guarantee Corporation, Limited) Plaintiff v. James Widdington Shand, Harvey Alexander Young, and the National Insurance and Guarantee Corporation, Limited, Defendants" (1893-J-No. 1928), from the Honourable Mr. Justice Chitty to the Honourable Mr. Justice Vaughan Williams.

HERSCHELL, C.

LEGAL NEWS.

OBITUARY.

By the death of Mr. GEORGE COOKE, which took place on the 11th inst. in his 90th year, Bristol has lost its oldest solicitor. Mr. Cooke having been admitted as far back as 1826. Until a few years ago, when he retired from practice, he was the head of the present well-known firm of Messrs. Isaac Cooke, Sons, & Dunn. He was a sound Churchman and a strong Conservative, and for many years took an active part in the municipal affairs of his city. He leaves a family of five sons and two daughters.

Mr. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD, who died last week, was born at Haddam, Connecticut, in 1805, was admitted to the bar of New York in 1828, and entered at once upon a career at the bar which covered a period of sixty years, during more than half of which he was admitted at the head of his profession in the United States. Fifty-five years ago, says the *Times*, he began the work of a reform of the judiciary with which his name is identified at home and abroad. He published a pamphlet on the subject in 1839. In 1841 he prepared three important Bills embodying these ideas of reform, but it was five years before his influence began to have effect on the local Legislature. In 1847 he was appointed Commissioner of Practice and Pleadings, and in that capacity took a leading part in preparing a code of procedure, which was finally adopted by the State of New York in 1850. This code introduced many radical changes, and has been taken by foreign nations as a basis for similar reforms, while twenty-four of the States of the Union have adopted nearly all of its principal features. In 1857 he was appointed head of a Commission to prepare a political code, penal code, and civil code. This work was completed in the year 1865, but only the penal code was adopted by the State.

The death is announced of Mr. JOSEPH GUEDALLA, solicitor, of the firm of Kaye & Guedalla, of Essex-street, Strand, London. "One who knew him," writing in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, says:—"Though his name, or the name of his firm, was seldom seen in the reports of any of the celebrated cases, he was almost invariably in some way or other mixed up with them, and, after his great friend, Sir George Lewis, with whom he constantly worked, there was nobody who knew more of the secret social history of his time. He was by nationality a Portuguese, and by profession a Jew, but he would be better understood if described as a clever, kindly man of the world, who earned his living and everybody's liking by adjusting their differences quietly and fairly with perhaps unusual consideration for the claims of those who did not employ him. Though widely known he was not a man of notoriety, for his motto was to keep his clients out of the courts, arguing, and proving in many cases, that he could get more for them with less expense than any judge or jury was likely to give. Ill-health made Mr. Guedalla seem a much older man than he really was, for of late he looked almost any age, whereas he only owned to being under fifty. Heart trouble haunted him for years, but, though it bowed his frail little body and kept him fighting for breath for very long periods, it could not damp his spirits or lessen his love of life. He leaves two sons, whom he articleed respectively to Messrs. Ashurst & Morris and Messrs. Deloitte & Dever; as also two daughters. He is believed to have left an enormous fortune."

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. M'CALL, Q.C., and Mr. RICHARD SHARLE, barrister, have been elected Benchers of the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple, in succession to the late Mr. Speed, Q.C., and the late Lord Hannen.

Mr. SWINFORD LEBLIE THORNTON, barrister (Registrar, Supreme Court, and Commissioner of the Court of Requests, Malacca, Straits Settlements), has been appointed Attorney-General of the Island of St. Vincent.

Mr. CHAS. WM. DALBIAC, solicitor, 2, Bedford-row, W.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Dalbiac was admitted in November, 1876.

Mr. HENRY PURCELL DAY, solicitor, Nottingham, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Day was admitted in December, 1887.

Mr. THOS. HOWARD DEIGHTON, solicitor, 44, King William-street, E.C.,

has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Deighton was admitted in July, 1887.

Mr. GEORGE WM. EDWARDS, solicitor, Liverpool, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Edwards was admitted in July, 1887. He is a commissioner for the County Palatine of Lancashire, and a commissioner for South Australia.

Mr. SAMUEL DAVID EVANS, B.A., solicitor, Cowbridge, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Evans was admitted in December, 1887.

Mr. ROBERT SPENCER TAYLOR ELEY, solicitor, Burslem, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Eley was admitted in January, 1888.

Mr. WM. HENRY ELLIS, solicitor, Llanfairfechan, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Ellis was admitted in January, 1887.

Mr. HENRY EDMUND FRANKS, solicitor, Willesden-park, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Franks was admitted in December, 1879.

Mr. JOHN WALTER GREEN, solicitor, St. Helens, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Green was admitted in December, 1887.

Mr. ARTHUR GEIPEL, solicitor, West Hartlepool, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Geipel was admitted in April, 1885. He is a notary public.

Mr. RICHARD WALTER GLASCODINE, solicitor, Wrexham, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Glascodine was admitted in January, 1888.

Mr. JOHN GRAHAM, solicitor, Wigan, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Graham was admitted in December, 1887, after having passed the Final Examination with honours. He is a notary public.

Mr. JOHN GEORGE GODARD, solicitor, 32, Gresham-street, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Godard was admitted in December, 1887.

Mr. JOHN GRAVES, solicitor, Devonport, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Graves was admitted in November, 1879.

Mr. DAVID HALE, B.A., solicitor, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Hale was admitted in October, 1887. He is clerk to the Leicestershire County Magistrates (Ashby-de-la-Zouch Division) and clerk to the Derbyshire County Magistrates (Swadlincote Division).

Mr. EDWIN FREDERICK HILL, M.A. Oxon., solicitor, Granville House, Arundel-street, Strand, W.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Hill was admitted in April, 1881.

Mr. ROBERT HOLE, solicitor, Minehead, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Hole was admitted in November, 1886. He is clerk to the local board.

Mr. EVERALL HIND, solicitor, Goole, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Hind was admitted in November, 1887.

Mr. CHAS. ALFRED HEITZMAN, solicitor, Cardiff, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Heitzman was admitted in July, 1887.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER HORNER, solicitor, Leyburn, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Horner was admitted in April, 1887.

Mr. THOMAS PENMAN HASLAM, solicitor, Wolverhampton, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Haslam was admitted in July, 1887.

Mr. ROBERT GARSIDE IVES, LL.B., solicitor, Staleybridge, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Garside was admitted in January, 1888.

Mr. ARTHUR JOSEPH JEKYLL, solicitor, 41, Threadneedle-street, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Jekyll was admitted in July, 1887.

Mr. JOHN STANLEY KENT, solicitor, 55, Basinghall-street, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Kent was admitted in December, 1884.

Mr. JOSIAH LONGLAND, solicitor, 2, Union-street, Warrington, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths.

GENERAL.

Lord Coleridge has been suffering from the effects of a cold, which has confined him to the house for the last few days, but is now much better.

The death is announced of Mr. John Christopher Wannop, one of the oldest solicitors in Carlisle, who was found dead in the hall of his house on Monday. It appears that while taking off his boots in the hall with a view of going upstairs to bed, he overbalanced himself, and falling heavily upon the tiled floor fractured his skull.

Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode have in the press a work on the "Sale of Food and Drugs Acts, 1875 and 1879," annotated, with copious references and notes of cases reported since the passing of the Acts, for the use of practising barristers and solicitors, and of magistrates and local authorities, by T. C. H. Hedderwick, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

In responding to the toast of "The Bench" at the dinner of the Institute of Mechanical Engineers, on Wednesday, Mr. Justice Romer said that the engineers and the legal profession had many points of sympathy. He believed that as time passed on, and as science increased, the bench would see more and more of the skilled experts of the profession of mechanical engineers who would assist the bench to decide the

important questions which came before it. He desired to take that opportunity of stating what great assistance the bench had received from members of their profession.

At a meeting of justices of the peace held in the Victoria Law Courts, Birmingham, on Wednesday, correspondence was read on the question of the Assizes Relief Act and the course which justices should adopt with regard to it. Among the letters was one from the Lord Chief Justice to the Home Secretary with regard to a question asked by Mr. Powell Williams in the House of Commons. His lordship wrote:—"My dear Mr. Asquith,—With a single exception the question of Mr. Powell Williams accurately states what I stated to the grand jury of Worcestershire. I did not state that the judges had now come generally to the opinion that prisoners should not be committed over the assizes. To recommend such a course in all cases would have been to recommend a practical repeal of an Act of Parliament by judicial authority—a course, in my opinion, quite indefensible. Interpreting general words in an Act of Parliament is a very different matter; and I have always been, and am, of opinion that lapse of time between the committal and the trial of a prisoner is a special circumstance to be considered by the magistrates in their discretion when they commit a prisoner for trial. For some time the judges took very different views on this point, and I am not sure that they are all absolutely of one opinion now. But a very large majority are now of the opinion I have expressed.—I am, &c., COLERIDGE."

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON			
Date.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice CHITTY.	Mr. Justice NORTH.
Monday, April	Mr. Leach	Mr. Rolt	Mr. Carrington
Tuesday	Godfrey	Farmer	Lavie
Wednesday	Leach	Rolt	Carrington
Thursday	Godfrey	Farmer	Lavie
Friday	Leach	Rolt	Carrington
Saturday	Godfrey	Farmer	Lavie
ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON			
Date.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice CHITTY.	Mr. Justice NORTH.
Monday, April	Mr. Leach	Mr. Rolt	Mr. Carrington
Tuesday	Godfrey	Farmer	Lavie
Wednesday	Leach	Rolt	Carrington
Thursday	Godfrey	Farmer	Lavie
Friday	Leach	Rolt	Carrington
Saturday	Godfrey	Farmer	Lavie

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

CHAMBERLAYNE.—April 16, the wife of Stanes Chamberlayne, barrister-at-law, of a son.
NORWOOD.—April 11, at Charing, Kent, the wife of Charles Norwood, solicitor, of a daughter.

PARR.—March 13, at Cliff House, The Park, Nottingham, the wife of George Parr, solicitor, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

DOUGLAS-JONES-SEEKER.—April 12, at Upton Old Church, Slough, William Douglas-Jones, M.A., solicitor, Bangor, to Maude, only daughter of Edward Onslow Seeker, J.P., Slough.

DEATHS.

BARBER.—April 9, at Bangor, Henry Barber, solicitor and notary, aged 73.
BEAUMONT.—April 12, suddenly, at 30, Wigmore-street, Thomas Beaumont (Lake, Beaumont, & Lake), of 10, New-square, aged 53. R.I.P.
MUNSTER.—April 11, at Novington Manor, Plumpton, Henry Munster, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law.

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS & LESSEES.—Before purchasing or renting a house have the Sanitary arrangements thoroughly examined by an expert from The Sanitary Engineering & Ventilation Co., 65, next the Meteorological Office, Victoria-st., Westminster (Estab. 1875), who also undertake the Ventilation of Offices, &c. [ADVT.]

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 13.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

AFRICAN EXPLORATION AND INVESTMENT CO., LIMITED.—All persons having claims against the company are required to lodge the same with Henry Ward, 6, Queen st place, within ten days. Dated April 11

ANGLO-AMERICAN PRINTING CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before April 30, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Benjamin Newstead, 3, Church passage, Guildhall. Marshall & Marshall, solrs for liquidator

BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, LIMITED.—Ptn for continuance of voluntary winding up, presented April 11, directed to be heard on Wednesday, April 25. Murray & Co., 11, Birch lane, solrs for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 24

GOLD TRUST AND INVESTMENT CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 11, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to John Jameson Truran, 184, Gresham House, Old Broad st

GRANITE SILICON PLASTER CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before April 30, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Benjamin Newstead, 3, Church passage, Guildhall. Roy & Cartwright, solrs for liquidator

HOOVERSON & CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 25, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Benjamin Howarth, 25, North John st, Liverpool. Simpson & Co, Liverpool, solrs for liquidator

IRVING WORKS, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented April 9, directed to be heard on April 25. Hicklin & Co., 1, Trinity sq, Southwark, solrs for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 20

LEWIS COTTON SPINNING CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 10, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to George Haward Adhead, 95, Portland st, Manchester. Rigby, Manchester, solr for liquidator

OTARD DE MONTEBELLO COGNAC CO., LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented March 6, directed to be heard on Wednesday, April 25. Irvine & Co, 8, Hart st, Mark lane, solrs for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 24

PHILIP MORRIS & CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 31, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to John Dalgleish, 8, Old Jewry. Michael Abrahams & Co, 8, Old Jewry, solrs for liquidator

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 17.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BOOTHMAN, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before April 25, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Edwin Playster Steeds, 30, Friar lane, Leicester. Jackson & Jackson, 61, Lincoln's inn fields, solrs for liquidator

BRITISH TEMPERANCE BREWERY CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 22, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles W. Cornish, 1, Gresham bldgs, Basinghall st

F. BULLOUGH & CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 29, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederic Siddall Marsh, 8, Bowker's row, Bolton

IVEL CYCLE CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before May 29, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to C. C. Baker, 1, Gresham bldgs, Basinghall st

JOHN GREENWOOD & CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before June 1, to send in their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to John Joseph Thompson, Victoria bldgs, St. Mary's gate, Manchester. Boote & Edgar, Manchester, solrs for liquidator

LONDON AND SOUTH AFRICAN AGENCY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before July 1, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Fell Dalgleish, 83, Hatton garden

PICCADILLY CHAMBERS, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented April 13, directed to be heard on Wednesday, April 25. Rickards & Moxley-Stark, 6, Norman st, solrs for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 24

STAR BOVETT, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented April 12, directed to be heard on April 25. Andrews, 18, Essex st, Strand, solr for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 24

ZAMBESI (GAZA) CONCESSIONS CO., LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented April 11, directed to be heard on April 25. Castle, 34, King st, Cheapside, solr for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 24

ZAMBESI (BOVALA) CONCESSIONS CO., LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented April 11, directed to be heard on April 25. Castle, 34, King st, Cheapside, solr for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of April 24

CREDITORS' NOTICES.

UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 3.

BASSETT, DINAH, GROSVENOR st West, Birmingham April 25 Bassett v Bassett, North, J Brady, Birmingham

UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, March 30.

BIRNIE, MICHAEL, Narbrough, Leicester, Baker May 11 Baines, Leicester

CHUBB, MARY ANN, Plymouth, Spinster April 30 Greenway & Son, Plymouth

COOPER, LOUISA OLDACRE, Barton, Lincoln, Widow May 7 H E & B Mason, Barton upon Humber

DRANE, ELIZABETH CHRISTIAN, Hintlesham, Suffolk, Widow April 25 Josselyn & Sons, Ipswich

DOSWELL, HENRY, Leeds April 30 Foster, Leeds

FOSTER, LEONARD, Kirklington, Contractor May 5 Dowson & Co, Bedford row

HANKE, WILLIAM ARUNDELL, Charnminster, Gent June 1 Symonds & Sons, Dorchester

HUMPHREYS, JAMES THOMAS, Tottenham, Gent May 1 Taylor & Co, St James st

JENKINS, DAVID, Flemingsstone Court, Glam, Yeoman April 27 Lewis & Jones, Merthyr Tydfil

JESSOP, JOHN EDMUND, Maidenhead, Esq May 1 Brown & Elmhirst, York

LANGLANDS, GEORGE, Hebburn, Grocer April 13 Stanford, Newcastle upon Tyne

LEWIS, THOMAS BURROW, Oxford st, Baker May 9 Drake & Co, Rood lane

NUNNS, WILLIAM, Horforth, Yeoman May 11 Newstead & Co, Otley

PATTERSON, ROBERT, Sunderland March 30 Graham & Shepherd, Sunderland

PORTER, JOHN, Coventry, Licensed Victualler May 31 Twist & Sons, Coventry

PURCHAS, SAMUEL, Barbourne, Worcester, Civil Engineer May 12 Jeffery, Worcester

SAUNDERS, ELIZABETH JANE, Fordington, Dorset June 1 Symonds & Sons, Dorchester

SAUNDERS, RICHARD JAMES HARRIS, Ceara, Brazil, Civil Engineer May 5 Dodd, New Broad st

SCOUALL, EDWARD FOWLER, Huddersfield, M.D. April 30 Wrensted & Sharp, Great Trinity lane

SIMMONS, HONORA CATHARINE FASHAM, Lower Walmer May 5 Brown & Brown, Deal

TERRITT, WALTER, Tunbridge Wells, Esq June 23 Toser & Co, Dawlish

VERNEY, SIR HARRY, Winalow, Bucks, Bart May 1 Western & Sons, Strand

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 3.

BARKER, ROBERT, Gt Aytton, Yorks, Farmer April 25 Carrick, Stokesley

BLACK, CATHERINE, Tottenham May 1 Jobson, Lincoln's inn fields

BRANDWOOD, JANE, Warrington, Spinster May 19 Davies & Co, Warrington

BRAYSHAW, THOMAS, East Loftus, Yorks, Schoolmaster May 3 Jackson & Jackson, Middlesbrough

BUSHELL, JOHN, Birmingham, Electro Plate Manufacturer May 1 Chinn, Birmingham

CHILDS, ROSA, Wakefield May 10 Smith, Wakefield

CLARKE, CHARLES, Birmingham, Bricklayer April 19 Mogford, Birmingham

CLARK, FRANCIS SAMUEL, Bath, Solicitor May 5 Dyer, Bath

COHEN, GEORGE, Dalston, Gent May 2 Shearman, Gresham st

DICKINSON, SUSANNAH, St Albans June 1 Annesley, St Albans

DIMMOCK, MARY SMITH, Fradwell Hall, Staffs April 11 Davies, Strand

EDGE, JAMES THOMAS, Strelley Hall, Notts, Esq April 30 Renshaw & Co, Suffolk lane

ELWYN, REV WILLIAM MAUNDY HARVEY, Ventnor April 30 Urry, Ventnor

FRANCIS, GEORGE BAGGETT, Esq, Hartford, Druggist May 1 Stanley & Co, Ludgate Hill

GHOST, CAROLINE CHARLOTTE, Bath April 25 Bartlett, Bath
 GOLDING, GILES, Tredgar, Cardiff May 15. Shepard, Tredgar
 HARRISON, Rev WILLIAM WALKER ESTCOURT, Northwich April 21 Trafford & Cook, Northwich
 HIGGS, JOHN, Brierley Hill, Pawnbroker May 5 Gay Pritchard, Birmingham
 HOGG, ELIZABETH DIANA, Leeds, EDITH BIGNY, Leeds, and MARY ANN BAILEY, Bradford May 19 Turner & Turner, Leeds
 INGLIS, CHARLES HENRY, Spennithorne, Major Gen May 1 Maughan, Middleham
 LUDLOW, Rev EDWARD, Winderbourne St Martin May 5 Andrews & Co, Dorchester
 MAYO, WILLIAM, Friar Waddon, Dorset, Gent May 5 Andrews & Co, Dorchester
 MACKENZIE, Vice-Admiral DONALD McLEOD, Eltham May 5 Crawley & Co, Whitehall place
 MORLEY, EDWIN, Halifax, Worsted Spinner May 7 Godfrey & Co, Halifax
 MURRAY, SARAH, Clifton, Widow May 12 Brembridge & Luke, Exeter
 NEWCOMBE, WILLIAM HORATIO NEEDHAM, Chatham, Outfitter May 1 Mann, Chatham
 PEARLINS, JAMES READ, Mitcham May 1 Timbrell & Deighton, King William st
 ROWELL, JOHN THOMAS, Streatham, Esq May 1 Cooper & Co, Birchlin lane
 SESSIONS, GEORGE THOMAS, Oxford, Architect May 1 Galpin, Oxford
 SHAW, HENRY PARKINSON, Kensington, Esq May 15 Turner, Leadenhall st
 SMITH, CATHERINE TAYLOR, Hampstead May 5 Potter & Co, King st
 SMITH, Mrs SUSANNA, Leysters, Hereford, Widow May 28 C D & H Andrews, Locominster
 TERRELL, MARY, South Petherton May 1 Newman & Co, Yeovil
 TOWNLEY, THOMAS, Preston May 10 Ambler & Rawthorn, Preston
 WESS, SARAH CAROLINE, Walton on Thames May 10 Godfrey & Webb, Walton on Thames
 WILCOCK, JOHN BUTTON, Ealing, Gent May 1 Stanley & Co, Ludgate hill
 WILLIAMS, WILLIAM, Southtown, Suffolk, Laundryman April 28 Wiltshire & Son, Great Yarmouth
 WILLINGTON, MARGARET LOUISA, Knowle, Warwick May 10 Lane & Clutterbuck, Birmingham
 WINDER, EDWIN, Grove gdns, Regent's Park, Gent May 1 Stanley & Co, Ludgate hill
 WORSY, ROBERT, Norwich, Gent May 1 Miller & Co, Norwich

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 6.

BAILEY, JAMES, Newchapel, Miner April 16 Hollishead & Moody, Tunstall
 BRIDGES, FREDERICK THOMAS, Tonbridge May 5 Alleyne & Co, Tonbridge
 BRITTON, EDWARD, Manchester, Hosier April 30 Bartow & Smith, Manchester
 BROOKS, ABRAHAM, Freemantle, Gent May 21 King, Bristol
 BUTLER, THOMAS, Copthall bldgs May 4 Renshaw & Co, Suffolk lane
 CAREUTHERS, MARIA AUGUSTA D'ALMEIDA, Brighton Mar 4 Witham & Co, Gray's inn square
 COCK, BETHIA, Newquay, Cornwall, Hotel Proprietor May 10 Collins & Son, St Columb
 CHARTRE, JOHN, Bradford, Contractor May 4 Burr & Co, Keighley
 DOCKER, JOHN, Kentish Town, Grocer May 16 Sowton, Bedford row
 DONVILLE, EDWIN ARTHUR BARRY, Weymouth, Solicitor May 7 Wilson & Genge, Epsom
 DOWNES, SAMUEL, Colchester, Gent. May 4 Prior, Colchester
 DUNE, THOMAS, Burton in Wirral, Clerk in Holy Orders May 7 Gamon & Co, Chester
 FERGUSON, JOHN, Forest Gate, Iron Ship Cementer May 10 Preston, Stratford
 FORREST, ANN, Hastings April 30 Leader, Mark lane
 GIBBINS, LOUISE VICTOIRE ALPHONSE, Lewes May 19 Hanhart, Southampton st
 GOOD, WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Boot Maker May 9 Stephenson & Mountain, Gt Grimsby
 GUEST, JOHN, Crediton, Gent May 1 Wellington, Crediton
 HARWOOD, JONATHAN, Bloxham, Gent May 1 Fairfax, Banbury
 HILLIER, JAMES, Trowbridge, Innkeeper May 1 Mann & Rodway, Trowbridge
 HOOPER, CHARLES, Stroud, Timber Merchant May 10 Winterbotham & Sons, Stroud
 JACOBS, ANGEL HENRY, Charing Cross May 15 Powell, Old Burlington st
 JONES, WILLIAM, Southampton, Gent May 7 Rawlings, Walbrook
 JUDD, JOHN, Slough, Saddler May 9 Cecil Durant, Windsor
 LEE, DAVID, Southampton, Gent May 21 Farrar & Co, Manchester
 LEMAGE, WALTER, Hartow rd, Grocer May 14 Kinsey & Co, Bloomsbury pl
 MARSHALL, JAMES, Holland park, Silk Mercer May 21 Baileys & Co, Berners st
 McDOWELL, JANE, Sowerby May 7 Fryer, West Hartlepool
 MEYNEY-THOMPSON, FLORENCE MILDRED, Lennox gdns, Spinster May 31 Pemberton & Garth, Lincoln's inn
 MILLER, JOHN, Birmingham, Accountant May 15 King & Ludlow, Birmingham
 MOORE, JULIA, Hove, Widow May 5 Lee & Pembertons, Lincoln's inn fields
 MORRISH, ELIZA, Portland May 31 Were & Frapp, Plymouth
 NOWATY, MARY ELIZABETH, Clapham Common April 30 Tickle, Chapside
 OCEBI, ELIZABETH ANNIE GAMBLE, Blackheath May 9 Peddar, Palmerston bldg
 OAKES, EMMELINE ELIZABETH, Sheffield May 22 Webster & Styring, Sheffield

PAIGE, WILLIAM, Portman mansions May 5 Templeton & Cox, King's Bench walk
 PORTCROFT, WILLIAM, Sidcup April 30 Tichener, Sidcup
 ROSE, ANDREW, Baywater, Esq May 5 Tatham & Pym, Old Jewry
 SAYER, SARAH MATILDA, South Yarra, Melbourne April 12 Wilkins & Co, Gresham square
 SCIFED, JOHN FRANCIS, Beckenham May 6 Cordwell, Old Serjeant's inn
 SCOTT, LUKE, Alnwick, Hairdresser May 15 Douglas, Alnwick
 SEPTON, THOMAS PETER, St Helena, Glassworker May 13 Webster, St Helena
 SIMES, TILDEN DOUGLAS, Twickenham May 8 Etherington, Mortlake
 SMART, FREDERICK BERTMAN, Walton on Thames May 7 Jessop, Godman st
 SQUIRE, ANN, Loughborough May 12 Toome & Bartlett, Loughborough
 TOWNLEY, THOMAS, Preston May 10 Ambler & Rawthorn, Preston
 VIRGO, THOMAS WILLIAM, Upton Park, Leather Seller May 10 Preston, Stratford
 WARNER, HUGO LAZARFIELD, Ball's Pond rd May 5 Beard & Sons, Basinghall st
 WISHART, JANE, Monkwearmouth May 2 Stockdale, Sunderland

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 10.

BALLS, CHARLES, Birmingham, Corn Merchant May 14 Thomas, Birmingham
 BARBER, THOMAS, Bollington, Macclesfield May 8 Wadsworth, Macclesfield
 BIRACCA, ANTONIO, Oxford st, Restaurant Proprietor May 5 Roscoe & Crailsheim, Fen-church st
 BRACKER, EDWARD, Clapham May 31 Robinson & Wilkins, King's Arms yd
 BRANCKER, THOMAS, Heysham Lodge, Lancaster, Esq May 10 Dawson, Hart st
 BROWN, WILLIAM, Leytonstone June 4 Loxley & Co, Chapside
 BUTLER, EMMA, Lincoln June 1 Toynbee & Co, Lincoln
 BUTLER, WILLIAM JOHN, Lincoln, Dean June 1 Toynbee & Co, Lincoln
 CALDECOTT, ANDREW, Husbands Bosworth, Esq May 31 Bannister & Reynolds, Basinghall st
 CLARE, LOUISA THEODORA, Bracknell, Berks May 31 Pemberton & Garth, Lincoln's inn
 CODLING, JOHN, Northenden, Cotton Spinner May 10 Cobbett & Co, Manchester
 DARELL, FANNY JULIA Lady, Upper Grosvenor st May 12 Trower & Co, Lincoln's inn
 DARELL, MARY ANNE, Tunbridge Wells June 1 Carlisle & Co, Lincoln's inn
 DAVIS, JAMES, Hambury, Glos, Farmer May 8 Veale Bros, Bristol
 DAUGHTON, ROBERT, Lincoln, Innkeeper April 18 Waite & Co, Boston
 DICKINSON, FRANCES STEPHANE, Balham July 15 Dickinson, Campden Hill rd
 ELPHINSTONE-STONE, B.N., Captain WESS E, Exmouth April 30 Genge & Mathew, Exeter
 GABRIEL, ANN, Wakefield April 29 Lister & Co, Wakefield
 GEE, ESTHER, Lytham, Lancs, Widow May 28 W & J Cooper, Preston
 HATFIELD, GEORGE, Doncaster, Newspaper Proprietor May 15 Parish & Hickson, St Swithin's lane
 HICK, JOHN, Whalley, Esq May 19 Earle & Co, Manchester
 HILL, SAMUEL, Gower st, Architect May 18 Smith & Sons, Furnival's inn
 HOLLIS, REUBEN, Filaley, Derby, Brewer May 19 Gratton & Marsden, Chesterfield
 HOPKINS, THOMAS, Bowdley May 10 Burcher, Kidderminster
 HORN, EMILY MARION, Highlands Mereworth, Widow May 10 Horne & Birkett, Lincoln's inn fields
 HUNTER, MARY, South Shields, Widow April 30 Osborne, South Shields
 JACKSON, SAMUEL PIN, Bristol, Oil Merchant May 26 Sturge, Bristol
 JEFFERY, FREDERICK, Edgware rd, Corn Merchant May 10 Ellis & Co, College hill
 JESSUP, CHARLES, Lincoln, Joiner June 1 Toynbee & Co, Lincoln
 JONES, DAVID WILLIAM HOARE, New South Wales May 15 Patey & Warren, London Wall
 JORDAN, GEORGE, Kingston upon Hull, Stonemason May 21 Stephenson, Hull
 KING, HUGH, Bournemouth, Draper May 21 Dickinson, Poole
 MENONI, PAUL, Sunderland, Jeweller May 5 Dingle, Sunderland
 MILMAN, HENRY SALUSBURY, South Kensington, Barrister June 1 Carlisle & Co, Lincoln's inn
 NICHOLSON, GEORGE, Bridlington, Cordwainer May 8 Brigham, Bridlington Quay
 PAULSON, JOHN, Ollerton, Notts, Gent June 5 Stenton & Metcalfe, Southwell
 RAFFER, MARY, Huddersfield May 14 Hall & White, Huddersfield
 RICHES, WILLIAM FREEMAN, Hackney, Gent May 31 Lovell & Co, Gray's inn sq
 SANDS, JAMES, Brighton, Stationer May 7 Piesse & Son, Old Jewry chambers
 SMYTH, CATHERINE, Brompton May 7 Hands, Throgmorton st
 TARR, JAMES, North Hush, Devon, Farmer June 1 Windatt & Windatt, Totnes
 TURNER, MARY ELIZABETH, New Buckenham May 10 Blyth, Norwich
 VAUDREY, WILLIAM, Fenton, Cratemaker April 30 Fifield Holton, Stoke upon Trent
 WALFORD, MARY, Hillingdon June 30 Woolley, Gt Winchester st
 WESLEY, FREDERICK JAMES, Forest Gate, Architect Gasquet & Metcalfe, Idol lane
 WILLIAMSON, ELLEN, Little Eaton May 5 Barber & Co, Derby

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 13.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BARBER, WILLIAM JOHN, Loughborough, Game Dealer Leicester Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 BARON, JOSEPH, once in Makersfield, Butcher Wigan Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 BAXTER, RICHARD, Nottingham, Painter Nottingham Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 BELL, JAMES, Coal Dealer Southampton Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 BENFIELD, BENJAMIN, New Swindon, Milk Seller Swindon Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 BENNETT, LANGFORD, Stowe, Farmer Banbury Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 BLAKE, ALBERT CHARLES, Llandrindod Wells, Builder Newtown Pet March 28 Ord April 9
 BLUNDEN, JAMES SEAGER, West Cowes, Grocer Ryde Pet April 9 Ord April 9

BOARDMAN, JOHN, Bolton, Hatter Bolton Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 BOLLAND, BENJAMIN, Bradford, Farmer Bradford Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 BOTT, JOSEPH ELTON, Stockport, Engineer Stockport Pet March 23 Ord April 11
 BOULTON, J, St George, Glos, Grocer Bristol Pet April 4 Ord April 10
 BOWDEN, JOHN, Arrington, Cambs, Farmer Cambridge Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 BREWIS, EDWARD, Basinghall st, Accountant High Court Pet Mar 7 Ord April 10
 BROADBURN, JOHN JAMES, Stockport, Wheelwright Stockport Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 BUSKIN, H M F, Mark lane, Corn Facker High Court Pet Feb 21 Ord April 10
 COFFEY, CHARLES EDWARD, Lowestoft, Major Gt Yarmouth Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 CORDLEY, CHARLES, Eye Green, Northants, Publican Peterborough Pet April 11 Ord April 11

CROSS, ARTHUR JAMES, Wareham, Norfolk, Farmer King's Lynn Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 CUNNINGHAM, JOHN, Gt Grimsby, Stevedore Gt Grimsby Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 DEACON, ARTHUR MILLS, W Norwood, Builder High Court Pet Feb 9 Ord April 10
 EDWARDS, JAMES, Blackpool, Manchester Pet March 29 Ord April 10
 FOSSETT, Rev WILLIAM STEWART, Acton Turville, Glos Bristol Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 GAUNT, FREDERICK, Farnley, Yorks, Cattle Dealer Bradford Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 GILBERT, THOMAS JAMES, Gravesend, Builder Rochester Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 HICKLEY, THOMAS HENRY, Kilburn, Traveller High Court Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 HITCHER, WILLIAM, Darlington, General Dealer Walsall Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 JACOBS, CHARLES, Ventnor, Greengrocer Ryde 11 Ord April 11

JEFFRIES, CHARLES EDWARD, Cheddar, Baker Wells Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 KNIGHT, THOMAS, Petham, Kent, Farmer Canterbury Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 LEMON, CHARLES, Paignton, General Dealer Plymouth Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 LEWIS, HYMAN, Leeds, Jeweller Leeds Pet March 12 Ord April 7
 LOADER, HENRY, Sway, Hants, Baker Southampton Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 MARSH, JOHN WILLIAM, Sheffield, Carting Contractor Sheffield Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 MARTIN, ROBERT, Marks Tey, Essex, Publican Colchester Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 MARTIN, WILLIAM THOMAS, Custom House, Essex, Cheesemonger High Court Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 MCOWEN, JOHN, Rochdale, Wheelwright Rochdale Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 MINZESHEIMER, EMMAUEL CHARLES, Burlington gins High Court Pet March 2 Ord April 11
 NESMYTH, CHARLES JAMES, Chertsey, Cotn Dealer Kingston, Surrey Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 PAVET, HARRY ALFRED, Kentish Town rd, Music Seller High Court Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 PEARCE, EDWARD JOHN THOMAS, Rochester, Joiner Rochester Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 ROPER, WILLIAM, Birmingham, House Painter Birmingham Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 SCHOTT, JACOB, Stockton on Tees, Commission Agent Stockton on Tees Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 SEVERA, JOSEPH, Rotherham, Plumber Sheffield Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 SMYTH, BENJAMIN FINOLAS, Liverpool, out of business Liverpool Pet March 28 Ord April 10
 STRANGE, WILLIAM, Dowlais, Glam, Baker Marthyr Tydfil Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 TALBOT, HARRY CAUCHLEY, Upper Tooting, Farrier High Court Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 THOROLD, FANCY, Clapham park Colchester Pet Mar 21 Ord April 10
 TODD, HARRY, Leytonstone, Grocer High Court Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 WASHINGTON, RALPH, Leighton, Salop, Farmer Shrewsbury Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 WATSON, JAMES, Kingston upon Hull, Builder Kingston upon Hull Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 WEATHERLY, GEORGE MORRIS, Leeds, Plumber Leeds Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 WHITING, HARRY, Islington, of no occupation High Court Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 WINSTONE, WALTER PUCKMORE, Cheltenham, Builder Cheltenham Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 YEWDALE, ALEXANDER HENRY, Leeds, Woollen Merchant Leeds Pet April 7 Ord April 7

FIRST MEETINGS.

ASH, JOSEPH LATHURBY, Birmingham, Shop Assistant April 25 at 11 33, Colmore row, Birmingham
 BARNISTER, THOMAS, Southampton, Cook April 20 at 3 Off Rec, 4, East st, Southampton
 BARKER, WILLIAM JOHN, Loughborough, Game Dealer April 25 at 3 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 BARON, JOSEPH, Ince in Makerfield, Lancs, Butcher April 20 at 2.30 Court house, King st, Wigan
 BESSON and Co, G, St John's Wood, Boot Polish Manufacturer April 20 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 BOARDMAN, JOHN, Bolton, Hatter April 20 at 11 16, Wood st, Bolton
 BOLLAND, BENJAMIN, Bradford, Farmer April 23 at 3 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
 BOWDEN, JOHN, Arrington, Cambs, Farmer April 24 at 12 Off Rec, 5, Petty Cury, Cambridge
 BULL, THOMAS, East Dulwich, Grocer April 20 at 3 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 CARVER, FRANCIS JAMES, West Derby, Lancs, Mercantile Clerk April 25 at 3 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 CHAMBERLAIN, ADOLPH HENRI, Bream's bldgs April 20 at 2 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 CHAMPNEYS, EDWARD H S, Hythe, Kent, Farmer April 20 at 2.30 Off Rec, 73, Castle st, Canterbury
 CORBYN, EDWIN HARTWELL, Norwich, Innkeeper April 21 at 12 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 COTTLE, THOMAS, Plymouth St Mary, Devon, Builder April 20 at 11.30 10, Athenium ter, Plymouth
 CROSS, ARTHUR JAMES, Wrexham, Norfolk, Farmer April 20 at 10.45 Court house, King's Lynn
 DAVIS, JOEL, Little Pulteney st, Butcher April 24 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 DAT, JAMES WILLIAM, Nottingham, Game Dealer April 20 at 12 Off Rec, 86 Peter's Church walk, Nottingham
 DOVE, HENRY, Bernard st, Builder April 24 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 FISCH, JOHN, Langley, Farmer April 23 at 11.30 Off Rec, St Paul's, Bedford
 FLETCHER, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Brassfounder April 23 at 11 23, Colmore row, Birmingham
 FULCHER, HERBERT ASHTON, Tewkesbury, Chemist April 20 at 3 Hop Pole Hotel, Tewkesbury
 GILBERT, THOMAS JAMES, Gravesend, Builder April 30 at 12 Off Rec, Rochester
 GRAY, JOHN EDWARD, Clapham, Builder April 20 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge
 HARDING, ELIZA, Camberwell rd, Wine Merchant April 30 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 HOLT, JOHN OAKES, Dudley April 20 at 11 Dudley Arms Hotel, Dudley
 HORNE, RICHARD, Leicester, Pawnbroker April 24 at 3 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
 JOLLY, CHARLES YOUNGMAN, Cronch Hill, Carpenter April 24 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 KNIGHT, THOMAS, Petham, Kent, Farmer April 20 at 2 Off Rec, 73, Castle st, Canterbury
 LOADER, HENRY, Sway, Hants, Baker April 20 at 3.30 Off Rec, 4, East st, Southampton
 MILLICAN, CLEMENT, Bournemouth, Grocer April 20 at 12.30 Off Rec, Salisbury
 MULLINE, ARNIST, Sheffield April 23 at 3 Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield

PARKINSON, BENJAMIN, Dewbury, Fish Salesman April 20 at 3 Off Rec, Bank chambers, Batley
 PAVET, HARRY ALFRED, Kentish Town rd, Music Seller April 23 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 PEARCE, EDWARD JOHN THOMAS, Rochester, Joiner April 30 at 11.30 Off Rec, Rochester
 PEGG, GEORGE, Burton on Trent, Grocer April 25 at 11.30 Midland Hotel, Station st, Burton on Trent
 RICKARDS, WILLIAM THOMAS, Camberwell rd, Clerk April 23 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 ROBINSON, JOHN, Monkseaton, Printer April 24 at 2 County Court, Newcastle upon Tyne
 ROOPER, STEPHEN JEFFRIES, Dalston April 25 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 ROPER, EDWIN, Croydon, Surgeon April 23 at 12.30 24, Railway approach, London Bridge
 SALTER, WILLIAM, Avebury, Wilts, Farmer April 21 at 12.30 Castle and Ball Hotel, Marlborough, Wilts
 SMITH, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Baywater April 25 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 SWART, ROBERT FLATTON, Doncaster, Fishmonger April 23 at 3.30 Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield
 THOMAS, OWEN, Carnarvon, Timber Merchant April 20 at 1.45 Prince of Wales Hotel, Carnarvon
 TIDEWELL, TEMPERANCE MARY, Birmingham, Metal Refiner April 24 at 11 23, Colmore row, Birmingham
 WALTON, HENRY, Oldbury, Worcester, Publican April 27 at 2 County Court, West Bromwich
 WASHINGTON, RALPH, Leighton, Salop, Farmer April 24 at 11.30 Off Rec, Shrewsbury
 WATMOUGH, THOMAS, Kingston upon Hull, Grocer April 25 at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House lane, Hull
 WATTS, THOMAS, Hoxton April 26 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 WILLIAMS, GEORGE FREDERICK, Gosport, Licensed Victualler April 20 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge Junction, High st, Portsmouth
 WOODHOUSE, HENRY, Grimaby, Smackowner April 21 at 11 Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Great Grimaby
 WRIGHT, ANDRINA JEMIMA, Stoke Newington, Widow April 26 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

ADJUDICATIONS.

ALDERSON, WILLIAM, Leekhampton High Court Pet Feb 15 Ord April 9
 BAILEY, WILLIAM GEORGE, Covent Garden, Florist High Court Pet Mar 8 Ord April 10
 BANNISTER, THOMAS, Southampton, Cook Southampton Pet April 6 Ord April 11
 BARKER, WILLIAM JOHN, Loughborough, Game Dealer Leicester Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 BARON, JOSEPH, Ince in Makerfield, Butcher Wigan Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 BELL, JAMES, Southampton, Coal Dealer Southampton Pet April 10 Ord April 11
 BENFIELD, BENJAMIN, Old Swindon, Milkceller Swindon Pet April 10 Ord April 11
 BLUNDER, JAMES SEAGER, West Cowes, Grocer Ryde Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 BOARDMAN, JOHN, Bolton, Hatter Bolton Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 BOLLAND, BENJAMIN, Dudley Hill, Yorks, Farmer Bradford Pet April 6 Ord April 6
 BOWDEN, JOHN, Attingham, Farmer Cambridge Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 BROADHURST, JOHN JAMES, Stockport Wheelwright Stockport Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 BUCHAN, EARL OF, Newbury, Berks Newbury Pet Feb 20 Ord April 11
 COOHLAN, BARRYMORE, Baywater, Railway Loan Contractor Brighton Pet Feb 10 Ord April 9
 CORDLEY, CHARLES, Eye Green, Northants, Publican Peterborough Pet Mar 31 Ord April 11
 COTTLE, THOMAS, Plymouth St Mary, Builder Plymouth Pet April 2 Ord April 10
 CROSS, ARTHUR JAMES, Wrexham, Norfolk, Farmer King's Lynn Pet April 7 Ord April 9
 CUNNINGHAM, JOHN, Gt Grimaby, Stevedore Gt Grimaby Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 DUTHOIT, FREDERICK ARTHUR, Dewsbury, Rag Merchant Dewsbury Pet Mar 20 Ord April 6
 GILBERT, THOMAS JAMES, Gravesend, Builder Rochester Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 HICKLEY, THOMAS HENRY, Kilburn, Traveller High Court Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 HIPWELL, DANIEL, Gt Tower st, Colonial Merchant High Court Pet Mar 21 Ord April 9
 HOLT, JOHN OAKES, Dudley Dudley Pet Mar 22 Ord April 9
 JACOBS, CHARLES, Vantnor, Greengrocer Ryde Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 KNIGHT, THOMAS, Petham, Kent, Farmer Canterbury Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 LEMON, CHARLES, Paignton, General Dealer Plymouth Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 LOADER, HENRY, Sway, Hants, Baker Southampton Pet April 9 Ord April 10
 MCOWEN, JOHN, Rochdale, Wheelwright Rochdale Pet April 9 Ord April 10
 MARSH, JOHN WILLIAM, Sheffield, Carting Contractor Sheffield Pet April 9 Ord April 10
 MARTIN, ROBERT, Marks Tey, Essex, Publican Colchester Pet April 9 Ord April 10
 MARTIN, WILLIAM THOMAS, Custom House, Essex, Cheesemonger High Court Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 PAVET, HARRY ALFRED, Kentish Town, Music Seller High Court Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 PEARCE, EDWARD JOHN THOMAS, Rochester, Joiner Rochester Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 PLUMMER, JAMES ALEXANDER, SMITHCHILD, Gravesend Rochester Pet March 31 Ord April 9
 REYNOR, WILLIAM, Walham Green, Builder High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord April 11
 SANDERSON, CHARLES HERBERT, Knockholt, Kent, Clerk High Court Pet Feb 28 Ord April 10
 SCHOTT, JACOB, Stockton on Tees, Commission Agent Stockton on Tees Pet April 7 Ord April 7

SEYERS, JOSEPH, Rotherham, Plumber Sheffield Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 STRANGE, WILLIAM, Dowlais, Glam, Baker Marthyr Tydfil Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 TAYLOR, RICHARD, Ashby de la Zouch, Cowkeeper Burton on Trent Pet March 19 Ord April 2
 THOMAS, OWEN, Carnarvon, Timber Merchant Bangor Pet April 6 Ord April 11
 TODD, HARRY, Leytonstone rd, Grocer High Court Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 WATSON, JAMES, Kingston upon Hull, Builder Kingston upon Hull Pet April 9 Ord April 9
 WEATHERLY, GEORGE MORRIS, Leeds, Plumber Leeds Pet April 7 Ord April 7
 WEST, FIELDING, Eastburn, Milk Dealer Bradford Pet March 31 Ord April 10
 WHITING, HARRY, Islington High Court Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 WILLIAMS, ISAAC, Tonyrefail, Glam, Sawyer Pontypridd Pet April 4 Ord April 11
 WINSTONE, WALTER PUCKMORE, Cheltenham, Builder Cheltenham Pet April 11 Ord April 11

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of April 10:—

STILES, HENRY, Rowde, Wilts, Farmer Bath Pet April 4 Ord April 4

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

GEE, THOMAS, Guildford st, Birmingham, Bricklayer Birmingham Adjud Jan 16, 1889 Annual March 15, 1894

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, April 17.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ALLEN, FREDERICK WILLIAM HENRY, Walham Green' Hairdresser High Court Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 BATTLE, HERBERT WALDEGRAVE, Mildmay Park, Commercial Traveller High Court Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 BENTLEY, THOMAS, Kingston upon Hull, Auctioneer Kingston upon Hull Pet April 12 Ord April 12
 BEST, FREDERICK, Croydon, Commercial Traveller Croydon Pet March 29 Ord April 12
 BLAKEMORE, WILLIAM JOSEPH, Cardiff, Dealer Cardiff Pet April 12 Ord April 12
 BRUNER, WILLIAM, Charlton Horethorne, Baker Yeovil Pet April 12 Ord April 12
 CROSS, ALBERT ERNEST, Wednesbury, Grocer Walsall Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 CUSH, GEORGE FREDERICK WILLIAM, Wainfleet All Saints, Auctioneer Boston Pet April 14 Ord April 14
 DELL, ROBERT, Brighton, Pawbroker Brighton Pet April 14 Ord April 14
 FENN, HARRY, Peckham, Builder High Court Pet March 7 Ord April 13
 FERGUSON, WILLIAM J, Bucklersbury High Court Pet Nov 8 Ord Feb 23
 FOORD, JAMES, Portobello rd, Builder High Court Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 FOX, BROOK, Nottingham, Jewellers Nottingham Pet March 31 Ord April 13
 FURBER, JAMES, Kinson, Dorset, Smith Poole Pet April 11 Ord April 11
 GRANGER, ALBERT JOHN TREBLE, Plymouth, Painter Plymouth Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 GREIG, GEORGE ALEXANDER, Commercial rd, Ironmonger High Court Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 HOLLAND, JOSEPH, Poplar, Builder High Court Pet April 14 Ord April 14
 HOLMES, GEORGE, Leeds, Boot Manufacturer Leeds Pet April 10 Ord April 10
 HUDDLESTONE, ANTHONY, Liverpool, Ship Steward Liverpool Pet March 22 Ord April 12
 JOHNSON, FRANCIS, Buxton, Tobaccoist Stockport Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 KING, TOM HUXHAM, Torquay, Lodging house Keeper Exeter Pet April 18 Ord April 13
 KNOWLES & MITCHELL, High Wycombe, Provision Dealers Aylesbury Pet April 2 Ord April 14
 KYZOR, WOLFE, Leeds, Cigar Manufacturers' Manager Leeds Pet April 13 Ord April 12
 LEAK, JOHN, Stratford High Court Pet March 20 Ord April 11
 LITTLEWOOD, WILLIAM ALBERT, Wheelwright Wakefield Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 LOVELL, JOHN GAUDER, Bedford, Auctioneer Bedford Pet April 2 Ord April 13
 PENNALL, ARTHUR, Fetter lane, Lithographic Artist High Court Pet April 12 Ord April 13
 PHILLIPS, FRED, Stoke Gifford, Glos, Butter Merchant Bristol Pet April 12 Ord April 12
 RADGERS, JOSEPH, Coventry, Watch Manufacturer Coventry Pet April 14 Ord April 14
 ROWLAND, FREDERICK ARTHUR ALEXANDER, Bucklersbury, Solicitor High Court Pet Feb 1 Ord April 12
 SAVORY, LEWIS JAMES, Stroud, Commission Agent Gloucester Pet April 14 Ord April 14
 SCANNELL, WILLIAM HENRY TILBURY, Southampton, Farmer Salisbury Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 SHAW, CHARLES, Hoyland, Yorks, Contractor Barnsley Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 SMITH, JOHN, Swansea, Commission Agent Swansea Pet April 12 Ord April 12
 SMITH, SAMUEL, Kingswood, Builder Bristol Pet April 13 Ord April 13
 STYNE, PERCY JAMES THOMAS, Hottsey Rise, Publisher's Manager High Court Pet Feb 31 Ord April 12
 TABERNER, BENJAMIN, Wigan, Provision Dealer Wigan Pet April 12 Ord April 12
 TIPPING, ELIZABETH ANN, and JOHN THOMAS TIPPING, Ashton upon Lyne Ashton upon Lyne Pet April 3 Ord April 13
 TONKINS, CHARLES, Leicester sq, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet April 14 Ord April 14
 TROWER, HERBERT ARTHUR, Throgmorton avenue High Court Pet March 15 Ord April 12

TUCKER, THOMAS, De Vere guns, Architect High Court Pet March 29 Ord April 13
WARR, W. Ashford, Farmer Kingston, Surrey Pet March 22 Ord April 13
WHITFIELD, John, Preston, Auctioneer Preston Pet April 9 Ord April 13
WILSON, DAVID, Ynyssybw, Glam, Coalminer Pontypidd Pet April 13 Ord April 13
WRIGHT, ERNEST JULIAN, Maltham, Yorks, Jeweller Huddersfield Pet April 14 Ord April 14

ORDER RESCINDING RECEIVING ORDER AND ANNULLING ADJUDICATION.

FILKINGTON, FRANCIS, Redhill st, Albany st, Iron Merchant High Court Rec Ord Feb 22, 1893 Adjud Aug 16, 1893 Rescued and Annulment April 11, 1894

FIRST MEETINGS.

ALLEN, FREDERICK WILLIAM HENRY, Walham Green, Hairdresser April 24 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey street
BATTELY, HERBERT WALDEGRAVE, Mildmay Park, Commercial Traveller April 24 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey street
BAXTER, RICHARD, Nottingham, Painter April 24 at 11 Off Rec, St Peter's Church walk, Nottingham
BELL, GEORGE, Southend, Bootmaker April 25 at 3 Off Rec, 38, Temple chambers, Temple avenue
BELL, JAMES, Southampton, Coal Dealer April 24 at 12 Off Rec, 4, East st, Southampton
BIGNORE, THOMAS, Luton, Hat Manufacturer April 25 at 2.30 Red Lion Hotel, Luton
BLAKE, ALBERT CHARLES, Llandrindod Wells, Builder April 25 at 1 Off Rec, Llandrindod Wells
BODIN, THOMAS, Birmingham, Baker April 25 at 11 23, Colmore row, Birmingham
BOULTON, J. Grosier April 25 at 12 Off Rec, Bank chambers, Corn st, Bristol
BROWN, ROBERT SAMUEL, Gt Grimsby, Smack Owner April 25 at 11 Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Gt Grimsby
BROWNLOW, CHARLES, and THOMAS KEYWORTH, Lincoln, Builders April 24 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Silver st, Lincoln
COWDREY, JAMES WILLIAM, Harpenden, Grocer April 25 at 12 Off Rec, 95, Temple chambers, Temple avenue
CRABTREE, CHARLES, Sharncliffe Common, Yorks, Grocer April 24 at 11 Off Rec, Bond ter, Wakefield
CULSHAW, EDWARD JAMES, Preston, Steamship Owner May 4 at 2.30 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
DERKING, EDWARD, Polesworth, Licensed Victualler April 25 at 12 29, Colmore row, Birmingham
FORBETT, WILLIAM STEWART, Acton Tiville, Clerk in Holy Orders April 25 at 1 Off Rec, Bank chambers, Corn st, Bristol
GATHERCOLE, JOHN, Barrow in Furness, Dock Labourer April 27 at 11 16, Cornwallis st, Barrow in Furness
GREEN, JOSEPH BENJAMIN, Wood Walton, Hunts, Farmer April 24 at 12.30 Off Rec, 61, Silver street, Lincoln
GREENING, ALFRED THOMAS, Bourne, Architect April 24 at 12 Grand Hotel, Bourne
HAINSWORTH, WILLIAM, Hassocks, April 25 at 12.30 Off Rec, 24, Railway app, London Bridge
HEALE, JOSEPH, Torquay, Furniture Dealer April 26 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Bedford cir, Exeter
HEERMANN, HENRY, and GERHARD BIRKENFELD, Cullum st, Restaurant Keepers April 24 at 12.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey street
HIRSCHBERG, S. Gracechurch st April 25 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey street
HITCHES, WILLIAM, Darlington April 25 at 11.30 Off Rec, Walsall
HUDDLESTONE, ANTHONY, Liverpool, Ship Steward April 25 at 3.30 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
JACKSON, WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Painter April 25 at 11.30 Off Rec, 16, Osborne st, Gt Grimsby
JEFFERIES, CHARLES EDWARD, Cheddar, Baker April 25 at 12.30 Off Rec, Bank chambers, Corn st, Bristol
KING, TOM HUXHAM, Torquay, Waiter April 26 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Bedford cir, Exeter
LEMON, CHARLES, Paignton, General Dealer April 25 at 11 10, Athelstan ter, Plymouth
MARTIN, WILLIAM THOMAS, Custom House, Essex, Cheese-monger April 25 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey street
MEARNS, MORDECAI, Penarth, Mason April 26 at 2.30 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff
NEALE, ERNEST B. Middlesborough, Grocer April 25 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough
PHILLIPS, F. D. Stoke Gifford, Butter Merchant April 25 at 3 Off Rec, Bank chambers, Corn st, Bristol
PROCTER, RICHARD, Penarth, Chemist April 26 at 11 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff
RILEY, FRANCIS BOLTON, Liverpool, Jeweller April 25 at 2 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
RODWAY, ALFRED JOHN, Sutton Coldfield, Tailor April 27 at 11 23, Colmore row, Birmingham
SCHMIDT, CARL LOUIS, and GEORGE HENRY MURGATROYD, Leeds, Firelighter Manufacturers April 25 at 12 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
SOLOMON, SAMUEL, Birkenhead, Draper April 25 at 2.30 Off Rec, 30, Victoria st, Liverpool
STILES, HENRY, Bowdle, Wills, Farmer April 25 at 12 15 Off Rec, Bank chambers, Corn st, Bristol
STOBART, JOHN, Leeds, Hop Traveller April 26 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
TABERNEER, BENJAMIN, Wigan, Provision Dealer April 24 at 10.45 Court house, King st, Wigan
TOTHILL, WILLIAM JOHN, Newport, Engineer April 25 at 12 Off Rec, Gloucester Bank chambers, Newport, Mon
TROTT, JOSEPH, Islington, Jeweller April 27 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey street
TUCKER, ARTHUR NATHANIEL, Cardiff, Colliery Agent April 26 at 3 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff
ULRICH, FRITZ, Upton Park, Restaurant Manager April 30 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey street
VASEY, MARIE (MIRIAM) LEON, Rutland gate, Widow April 30 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey street

VIAN, F J, Canning Town, Provision Dealer April 27 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey street
WALMSLEY, JOHN, Barrow in Furness, Innkeeper April 27 at 11.30 16, Cornwallis st, Barrow in Furness
WEBB, JOHN, Chigwell, Licensed Victualler April 24 at 3 Off Rec, 95, Temple chambers, Temple avenue
WILLIAMS, OWEN, Carnarvon, Tailor April 25 at 1.30 Crypt chambers, Chester

ADJUDICATIONS.

BARAS, SAMUEL HENRY, Bristol Bristol Pet April 4 Ord April 13
BAXTER, RICHARD, Nottingham, Painter Nottingham Pet April 11 Ord April 14
BENNETT, LANGTON, Stowe, Farmer Banbury Pet April 10 Ord April 12
BIRNBEITZ, EMIL RICHARD, Commercial rd East, Jeweller High Court Pet Mar 14 Ord April 11
BLAKE, ALBERT CHARLES, Llandrindod Wells, Builder Newtown Pet Mar 20 Ord April 14
BRUNKEE, WILLIAM, Charlton Horethorne, Baker Yeovil Pet April 12 Ord April 12
CASH, GEORGE FREDERICK WILLIAM, Wainfleet All Saints, Auctioneer Boston Pet April 13 Ord April 14
CROSS, ALBERT ERNEST, Wednesbury, Grocer Walsall Pet April 13 Ord April 13
DOVE, HENRY, Russell sq, Builder High Court Pet April 11 Ord April 7
EMERY, FRANCIS JOSEPH, Burslem Hanley Pet Mar 17 Ord April 13
GRANGER, ALBERT JOHN TREBLE, Plymouth, Painter Plymouth Pet April 13 Ord April 13
GREEN, JOSEPH BENJAMIN, Wood Walton, Hunts, Farmer Lincoln Pet April 6 Ord April 12
GROVES, LEONARD, Mark lane, Chemical Agent High Court Pet March 19 Ord April 11
HINDSON, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Birmingham Birmingham Pet April 3 Ord April 12
HITCHES, WILLIAM, Darlington Walsall Pet April 6 Pet April 11
HODGES, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Queen Victoria st, Financial Agent High Court Pet Feb 27 Ord April 13
HOLMES, GEORGE, Leeds, Bootmaker Leeds Pet April 10 Ord April 10
HUDDLESTONE, ANTHONY, Liverpool, Ship Steward Liverpool Pet March 20 Ord April 12
JEFFERIES, CHARLES EDWARD, Cheddar, Baker Wells Pet April 4 Ord April 12
JOHNSON, FRANCIS, Buxton, Joiner Stockport Pet April 13 Ord April 13
KING, TOM HUXHAM, Torquay, Lodging House Keeper Exeter Pet April 13 Ord April 13
KYZOR, WOOLF, Leeds Leeds Pet April 12 Ord April 12
LEES, JOHN, and ALFRED ASHTON DREWY, St John st, Licensed Victuallers High Court Pet March 14 Ord April 11
LITTLEWOOD, WILLIAM ALBERT, Wakefield, Joiner Wakefield Pet April 12 Ord April 13
MACE, JAMES, Brighton, Instructor of Boxing Brighton Pet April 6 Ord April 12
OVERBURY, ALFRED HAWKINS, Scarborough, Ironfounder Scarborough Pet March 15 Ord April 12
PATTELEY, HERBERT WALDEGRAVE, Mildmay Park, Commercial Traveller High Court Pet April 12 Ord April 12
PERRALL, ARTHUR, Fetter lane, Lithographic Artist High Court Pet April 12 Ord April 12
RADDOES, JOSEPH, Coventry, Watch Manufacturer Coventry Pet April 14 Ord April 14
REED, NICHOLAS WHITE, and ROBERT REED, Newcastle on Tyne, Builders Newcastle on Tyne Pet Feb 22 Ord April 10
RICKARDS, WILLIAM THOMAS, Walworth, Clerk High Court Pet April 7 Ord April 11
SAVERY, LEWIS JAMES, Stroud, Commission Agent Gloucester Pet April 14 Ord April 14
SHAW, CHARLES, Hoyland, Yorks, Contractor Barnsley Pet April 13 Ord April 13
SMITH, JOHN, Swansea, Commission Agent Swansea Pet April 13 Ord April 12
TALBOT, HARRY CHICHELY, Upper Tooting, Farrier High Court Pet April 9 Ord April 12
TROTTER, CLARENCE E. Pinebury pavement, Accountant High Court Pet Jan 10 Ord April 12
WHITFIELD, JOHN, Preston, Auctioneer Preston Pet April 6 Ord April 14
WILSON, DAVID, Ynyssybw, Glam, Coalminer Pontypidd Pet April 13 Ord April 13
WOOSTER, JOHN, Peckham, Cycle Manufacturer High Court Pet Feb 19 Ord April 12

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

SPENCER, JOSEPH JOHN HENRY, Southam, Warwickshire, Farmer Warwick Adjud July 22, 1893 Annul April 11, 1894

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

April 23.—Messrs. S. WALKER & RUNTZ, at the Mart, E.C., at 2 o'clock, Leasehold Block of City Offices (see advertisement, April 14, p. 4).
 April 24.—Messrs. FIELD & SONS, at the Mart, E.C., at 2 o'clock, Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 408).
 April 25.—Messrs. FURBER, PRICE, & FURBER, at the Mart, E.C., at 2 o'clock, Watton and Swaffham Railway Bonds and Stock (see advertisement, this week, p. 407).
 April 27.—Messrs. ELLIS & SON, at the Mart, E.C., at 2 o'clock, a Freehold Warehouse (see advertisement, this week, p. 407).
 April 27.—Messrs. BAKER & SONS, at the Mart, E.C., at 2 o'clock, Freehold Ground-rents and Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 408).

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE, which includes Indexes, Digests, Statutes, and Postage, 52s. WEEKLY REPORTER, in wrapper, 26s.; by Post, 28s. SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 26s. 0d.; by Post, 28s. 0d. Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 9d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE



MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

Corporation Robes, University and Clergy Gowns

ESTABLISHED 1698.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

REVERSIONS, ANNUITIES, LIFE INTERESTS, LIFE POLICIES, &c.

MESSRS. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD (successors to Marsh, Milner, & Co.), Land and Reversion Valuers and Auctioneers, may be consulted upon all questions appertaining to the above interests. Their Periodical Sales (established by the late Mr. H. E. Marsh in 1848) occur on the first Thursday in each Month throughout the year, and are the recognized medium for realising this description of property. Advances made, if required, pending completion, or permanent mortgages negotiated.—Address, 6, Poultry, London, E.C.

MESSRS. H. GROGAN & CO., 101, Park-street, Grosvenor-square beg to call the attention of intending Purchasers to the many attractive West-End Houses which they have for Sale. Particulars on application. Surveys and Valuations attended to.

BRICK-HILL-LANE, UPPER THAMES-STREET.

Freehold Warehouse, let on lease to the well-known wharfingers, Messrs. Major & Field, at a rent of £24 subject during the life of lady aged 46 to payments amounting according to the present rental of the property, to £144 15s. 4d. per annum, forming an attractive investment.

MESSRS. ELLIS & SON are directed to SELL BY AUCTION, at the MART, on FRIDAY, APRIL 27, at TWO precisely, a substantial Modern FREEHOLD WAREHOUSE, situate in Brick-hill-lane, Upper Thames-street, with frontages to Greenwich-street and Bell Wharf-lane, a valuable corner position, close to Southwark Bridge, containing six well-lighted and lofty floors, fitted with five loop-hole doors, and giving a superficial area of about 6,000 ft.; let on lease to Messrs. Major & Field, who have been in occupation for many years, at £24 per annum.

Printed particulars, with plan and conditions of sale, may be had of Messrs. Serr, Gribble, & Co., Solicitors, 12, Abchurch-lane; of Mr. G. B. Tatham, Solicitor, Ingleson, Yorkshire; at the Mart; and of Messrs. Ellis & Son, Auctioneers and Surveyors, 45, Fenchurch-street.

By direction of Trustees.—To Trustees, Insurance Companies, and gentlemen desiring an investment of the most secure character, producing an unfunctuating and punctually-paid income from English Railway Stock.

MESSRS. FURBER, PRICE, & FURBER will SELL BY AUCTION, at the MART, Token-house-yard, E.C., on WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, at TWO o'clock precisely, BONDS and STOCK of the aggregate nominal value of £9,999 6s. 10d. of the WATTON and SWAFFHAM RAILWAY, forming part of the system of the Great Eastern Railway Company, and leased by that Company for a term of 999 years, at a rental which produces upon the aforesaid bonds and stock a net annual income of £212 or thereabouts.

Particulars and conditions of sale may be had of Messrs. Black & Moss, Solicitors, 2, Clement's-inn, Strand; or at the Auction and Estate offices, Warwick-street, Gray's-inn.

SALE DAYS FOR THE YEAR 1894.

MESSRS. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & CO. beg to announce that the following days have been fixed for their SALES during the year 1894, to be held at the Auction Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, near the Bank of England, E.C.:-

Thurs., April 26	Thurs., June 28	Thurs., Oct. 11
Thurs., May 3	Thurs., July 12	Thurs., Oct. 25
Thurs., May 10	Thurs., July 19	Thurs., Nov. 1
Wed., May 30	Thurs., Aug. 2	Thurs., Nov. 15
Thurs., June 7	Wed., Aug. 15	Thurs., Nov. 29
Thurs., June 14	Thurs., Aug. 30	Tues., Dec. 4
Wed., June 20	Thurs., Sept. 13	Thurs., Dec. 13
	Thurs., Sept. 27	

Other appointments for immediate Sales will also be arranged.

Messrs. Farebrother, Ellis, Clark, & Co. publish in the advertisement columns of "The Times" every Saturday a list of their forthcoming sales by Auction. They also issue from time to time schedules of properties to be let or sold, comprising landed and residential estates, farms, freehold and leasehold houses, City offices and warehouses, ground-rents, and investments generally, which will be forwarded free of charge on application.—No. 29, Fleet-street, Temple-bar, and 18, Old Broad-street, E.C.

SUMMARY OF AUCTIONS
to be held by MESSRS.

FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & CO.,
at the AUCTION MART, E.C.,
On THURSDAY, APRIL 26th.

FREEHOLD INVESTMENTS, RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES, BUILDING ESTATES AND GROUND-RENTS at Walton-on-Thames.

SMALL FREEHOLD INVESTMENT arising out of the Albert Arms Public-house at Esher.

IMPORTANT FREEHOLD DETACHED and SEMI-DETACHED RESIDENCES at Boves Park, for occupation and investment.

FREEHOLD GROUND-RENTS and BUILDING PLOTS at New Southgate.

Extremely VALUABLE FREEHOLD BUILDING ESTATE of over three acres, within a short distance from Battersea-bridge, having important frontages, and being ripe for immediate development.

29, FLEET-STREET, TEMPLE-BAR, E.C.,

18, OLD BROAD-STREET, E.C.,

and

191, FINCHLEY-ROAD, HAMPSTEAD, N.W.

STOKE NEWINGTON AND CLAPTON COMMON.

By order of Mortgagees.—Valuable Freehold and Leasehold Investments, arising out of capital shops and business premises, some with stabling, prominently situated in some of the best parts of Stoke Newington-road and the High-street; Dwelling Houses, in Lewin-road and Bowling-green-place, the Boileau-house and shops adjoining, in Old Hill-street, Upper Clapton. The whole let mostly on leases and agreements, at total rents amounting to about £2,108 per annum. The leaseholds are held for terms of 83 years, at moderate ground-rents. Messrs.

FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & CO. will sell by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, on THURSDAY, MAY 10th, 1894, at TWO o'clock precisely, the above important PROPERTIES, in Lots, as follows:—

Lot	FREEHOLDS.	per annum.
1.	96, HIGH-STREET, Stoke Newington.—A Dyer's Shop, let, on lease, at...	£130
2.	96a, HIGH-STREET, and 37, LEWIN-ROAD.—Extensive Manufactory and Shop, Stabling, &c., let to Mr. Maynard, Confectioner, and Dwelling-house	296
3.	98 and 98a, HIGH-STREET.—Spacious Outfitter's Premises, let to Hogwood & Co., on lease at	240
4.	33 and 35, LEWIN-ROAD.—Two Dwelling-houses, total	56
5.	142, HIGH-STREET.—Fishmonger's Shop and Farrier's worth	130
6.	144 and 146, HIGH-STREET.—Manufactory, with Two Shops, Stabling, &c., on leases	340
7.	177, HIGH-STREET.—Oyster Bar and Premises, Stabling, &c., on lease at	60
8.	1 to 6, BOWLING-GREEN-PLACE.—Six tenements	124
9.	25, CLAPTON-COMMON, 70, 73, and 74, Old Hill-street, adjoining.—Residence called Boileau House, Baker's Premises, and Three Small Shops, rental value	136
10.	11 and 12, 64, 66, and 68, OLD HILL-STREET.—Confectioners, Chemist, and Boot Shops, and Premises above, let on leases and agreement	150
11.	160, STROKE NEWINGTON-ROAD.—Shop and Premises, with Stabling, producing together	109
12.	164, STROKE NEWINGTON-ROAD.—North London Stores, with off licence, and Stabling in rear	106
13.	174, STROKE NEWINGTON-ROAD.—Costumier's Shop	100
14.	176, STROKE NEWINGTON-ROAD.—Draper's Shop and Premises, let to Thomas & Owen, at	100

Total rentals ... £2,108
Particulars when ready may be obtained of Messrs. George & William Webb, Solicitors, No. 11, Austinfriars, E.C.; at the Mart, E.C.; and of Messrs. Farebrother, Ellis, Clark, & Co., 29, Fleet-street, Temple-bar; and 18, Old Broad-street, E.C.

AUCTION SALES.

MESSRS. FIELD & SONS' AUCTIONS

take place MONTHLY, at the MART, and include every description of House Property. Printed terms can be had on application at their Offices. Messrs. Field & Sons undertake surveys of all kinds, and give special attention to Rating and Compensation Claims. Offices: 54, Borough High-street, and 82, Chancery-lane, W.C.

BERMONDSEY.—FREEHOLD INVESTMENTS.

MESSRS. FIELD & SONS will sell by AUCTION at the MART, on TUESDAY, APRIL 24, at TWO, in Two Lots, excellently situated FREEHOLD PROPERTIES, comprising Nos. 163, 164, 165, and 166, Grange-road; Nos. 1 and 2 to 8, The Grange; and 1 to 13 (the whole of), Turner's-retreat, at rear; let partly on lease and partly to quarterly and weekly tenants, and producing nearly £400 per annum.

Particulars and plans may be had at the Mart: of Messrs. Bivington & Son, Solicitors, 1, Fenchurch-buildings, E.C.; and of the Auctioneers, 54, Borough High-street, and 82, Chancery-lane, W.C.

BERMONDSEY.

Sound Leasehold Investments.—By order of Executors and Trustees.

MESSRS. FIELD & SONS will sell by AUCTION at the MART, on TUESDAY, APRIL 24, at TWO, the capital WAREHOUSE, Stable, Dwelling-house, and Premises, No. 65, Earl-road, close to the Bricklayer's Arms Railway Depot. Let upon leases to old-standing tenants at the rate of £75 per annum, and held for an unexpired term of nearly forty years, at £9 per annum.

Particulars at the Mart; of Messrs. Hawkes, Stokes, & McEwan, Solicitors, 101, Borough High-street; and of the Auctioneers.

OLD KENT-ROAD.

Freehold Investment.—By order of Trustees.
MESSRS. FIELD & SONS will sell by AUCTION, at the MART, on TUESDAY, APRIL 24, at TWO, Two HOUSES and SHOPS, Nos. 100 and 101A, Albany-road, in the midst of a large industrial population, and producing £120 per annum.

Particulars as in preceding advertisement.

PECKHAM.

By order of the Executors of the late Mr. B. Rider.
MESSRS. FIELD & SONS will sell by AUCTION, at the MART, on TUESDAY, APRIL 24, at TWO, in Lots, eight HOUSES, Nos. 9, 10, 35 to 38, and 41 and 42, St. George's-street, Commercial-road, Peckham, producing a gross rental of about £240 per annum, and held for terms averaging about 55 years unexpired at ground-rents, and all in good order and well let.
Particulars may be had at the Mart; of Messrs. Head & Hill, Solicitors, 65 and 66, Chancery-lane; and of the Auctioneers, as above.

CITY OF LONDON AND SURREY.

By direction of the Trustees of the late G. Simons, Esq.—Valuable Freeholds, affording excellent investments, and comprising Nos. 9 and 10, Little Britain, Aldergate, in the City of London, consisting of large shop, business premises, and warehouse, having a frontage of about 35ft. to Little Britain, and an area of about 2,000ft. super. Let to Messrs. Simpson & Rook, on lease expiring 35th December, 1895, at a low old rental of £380 per annum. Also Two high-class Country Residences, known as The Lindens and Oak-lodge, Beddington-lane, Beddington, one minute from Beddington Station and tea minutes from Mitcham Junction Station. The Lindens, which was until recently in the occupation of the late Mr. Simons, and of the rental value of £190 per annum, is for sale with possession; it is especially adapted for a City gentleman requiring an inexpensive country residence within easy reach of town; Oak-lodge is let to a responsible tenant at £68 per annum.

MESSRS. BAKER & SONS will sell by AUCTION, at the MART, E.C., on FRIDAY, APRIL 27th, at TWO o'clock precisely, in Three Lots, the above valuable FREEHOLD PROPERTIES.

Particulars of Messrs. Allen & Edwards, Solicitors, 6, Great Winchester-street, E.C.; and of the Auctioneers, 11, Queen Victoria-street, London, E.C.

LEWISHAM and HURLINGHAM.

By direction of Trustees.—Freehold Ground-rents of £54 per annum, amply secured upon 13 houses, Nos. 21 to 33 (inclusive) Ardmore-road, Hither-green, Lewisham, 10 minutes from Ladywell and Lee Stations, and of the rack rental value of £280 per annum. Also Three Villa Residences, Nos. 44, 46, and 48, Hurlingham-road, Fulham, five minutes from Putney Station, and overlooking the Hurlingham Club Grounds, all let and together producing £128 per annum, and held for 95 years unexpired, at moderate ground-rents, the whole offering secure investments.

MESSRS. BAKER & SONS will sell by AUCTION, at the MART, E.C., on FRIDAY, APRIL 27th, at TWO o'clock precisely, in Seven Lots, the above desirable FREEHOLD and LEASEHOLD INVESTMENTS.

Particular of Hugh B. Peake, Esq., Solicitor, 2, Clement's-lane, Strand, W.C.; and of the Auctioneers, 11, Queen Victoria-street, E.C.

MORTGAGE SECURITIES Wanted for

the Investment of Trust Funds, Freehold or long Leaseholds, at 4 per cent. interest.—Particulars to be sent to Messrs. BARR, BURNETT, & ELDRIDGE, Surveyors, 14, Nicholas-lane, E.C.

HAMPSHIRE.

on the heights above Liss, Liphook, and Petersfield.

MESSRS. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD will sell at the MART, on WEDNESDAY, MAY 2nd, at TWO, in Lots, by order of the Executors of the late George Street, Esq., a valuable FREEHOLD ESTATE, comprising a handsome family residence, distinguished as Heathmont, standing well back from the Portsmouth high road, approached by a carriage sweep, on a plateau 600 feet above the sea level, commanding extensive and beautiful views. The house is most substantially built and well finished, has handsome reception rooms, ten bed rooms, ground-floor offices; capital stabling and out-offices, farmery, fine ranges of glass-houses. The pleasure gardens and lawns are laid out with great judgment and effectively planted with specimen trees and shrubberies, the original fine woods having been partially left and intersected with grass walks; kitchen garden, orchard, and paddock, the total area being about 16 acres. Also The Hermitage, a very picturesque freehold residence, suitable for a smaller establishment, enjoying all the advantages of position, being close to Heathmont, standing within garden grounds and lawns and plantations of about six acres, kitchen garden, coach-house, and stabling. Also the post-office at Rake, and eight Cottages, with their gardens.

Particulars of Messrs. Tucker, Lake, & Lyon, Solicitors, 4, Serle-street, Lincoln's-inn, W.C., and of Messrs. Edwin Fox & Bousfield, 99, Gresham-street, Bank.

PALL MALL.

Very valuable Freehold Building Estate, on the north and best side, having south aspect, possessing a commanding frontage, and covering the large superficial area of about 3,700ft.

MESSRS. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD will let by AUCTION, on a BUILDING LEASE, for 99 years, at the MART, on WEDNESDAY, MAY 9th, at TWO o'clock, the exceedingly valuable and important FREEHOLD ESTATE, forming the site of the extensive range of lofty premises, attractively situated, being No. 49, Pall-mall, one of the best positions in this first-class thoroughfare, having back entrance in Rose and Crown-yard, a frontage of 37ft. and extending to a depth of 104ft., the total superficial area being about 3,700ft., but little controlled by ancient lights, admirably adapted for the erection of a handsome pile of buildings devoted to professional, commercial, and residential purposes. Available, also, as a site for a bank, assurance office, or club-house, the extent and situation alike suiting either of these special objects. Possession will be given on completion of the letting. The materials on the ground included in the letting.

Particulars of Edward P. Davis, Esq., Solicitor, 57, New Broad-street, E.C.; and of Messrs. Edwin Fox & Bousfield, 99, Gresham-street, Bank, E.C.

INSURANCE COMPANIES, TRUSTEES, and others seeking exceptionally good Investments.

MESSRS. BRODIE, TIMBS, & CO. will sell by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, at TWO, in 24 Lots, the following first-class FREEHOLD GROUND-RENTS, amounting to £181 10s.

Secured upon:—	
£15 15s.	Dunster-house, Hornsey-lane, Crouch-end.
£19 10s.	Chesterville, Hornsey-lane, Crouch-end.
£14 14s.	Longleaf, Sunnyside-road, Hornsey-lane.
£13 13s.	Dunmarie, Sunnyside-road, Hornsey-lane.
£13 13s.	Redlynch, Sunnyside-road, Hornsey-lane.
£14 14s.	Fernleigh, Sunnyside-road, Hornsey-lane.
£13 13s.	Woodbury, Sunnyside-road, Hornsey-lane.
£13 13s.	Linclun, Sunnyside-road, Hornsey-lane.
£12 12s.	Tower-house, Orleans-road, Hornsey-rise.
£8 10s.	Alwyne-house, Orleans-road, Hornsey-rise.
£12 12s.	Fairbank, Orleans-road, Hornsey-rise.
£11 11s.	Edina, Orleans-road, Hornsey-rise.
£9 0s.	No. 13, Cromartie-road, Hornsey-rise.
£8 0s.	No. 14, Cromartie-road, Hornsey-rise.

With reversion to rack rentals of about £1,000 per annum. Also 10 valuable Freehold Residences, situate and known as:—

	Yearly Rental.
Tregenvor, Orleans-road, Hornsey-rise	£80
Claremont-house, Orleans-road, Hornsey-rise	85
Helatons, Orleans-road, Hornsey-rise	75
St. Helier's, Orleans-road, Hornsey-rise	70
No. 6, Cromartie-road, Hornsey-rise	50
No. 7, Cromartie-road, Hornsey-rise	50
No. 10, Cromartie-road, Hornsey-rise	55
No. 11, Cromartie-road, Hornsey-rise	50
No. 12, Cromartie-road, Hornsey-rise	55

Total rental ... £640
Particulars, with plan and conditions of sale, of Messrs. Merriman, Pike, & Merriman, Solicitors, 25, Austinfriars, and of the Auctioneers, 68, Finsbury-pavement, E.C., Hampstead, and Highgate.

LEYTON, E.

Re William Black, Esq., deceased.—Thoroughly well-secured FREEHOLD GROUND-RENTS of £430 a year, arising out of Eleven Houses and Shops and Ninety Private Houses, of the estimated rack-rental value of £2,700 per annum, situate at Leyton, Essex, in the main road (opposite the Town Hall), 54, George's-road, Leyton-park-road and Beconsfield-road, offering to trustees and others investments of the soundest character.

MR. ALFRED RICHARDS will sell the above by AUCTION at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on MONDAY, MAY 7th, at TWO o'clock precisely, in convenient Lots.

Particulars of John Jobson, Esq., Solicitor, 57, Lincoln's-inn-fields, W.C.; of Messrs. Stones, Morris, & Stones, Solicitors, 5, Finsbury-circus; and of the Auctioneer, 18, Finsbury-circus, E.C.

D
Y
he
e
th
au
ad
it
as
ad
he
e
ad
ly
m
as
ce
as
ag
us
so
eir
rs
in

ad
ng
out

D
E,
th,
ut
ire
49,
ass
m-
ft.,
the
the
ce-
le,
use,
dal
the
the

ow
ous-

ers

will
24
ID-

.
.
.
.
.
e.

m.
own
tal.

are.
are,
L.C.,

roll-
car,
nety
e of
asin
oad,
to
cter.
LL
ken-
dock

in's-
ones,
18,